

LEVEL
ONE

IBS

Vol. 13

April 1991



Printed by
Graduate Theological Union

MAY 15 1991

IRISH BIBLICAL STUDIES

Editor: Rev Professor J. C. McCullough
Union Theological College
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN

Associate Editors: Rev. Professor Ernest Best
13 Newmill Gdns
St. Andrews KT16 8RY

Rev. Professor E.A. Russell
Union Theological College
26 College Green, Belfast BT7 1LN

Assistant Editors: Rev. K.D.W. Crowe
Rev. D.J. Templeton

Editorial Advisory Panel:

Rev. Dr. David Hill, 3 Ashdill Court, 26 Westbourn Rd.,
Sheffield S10 2QQ.

Dr. J.G. McConville, Wycliffe Hall, Oxford OX2 6PW

Principal R.J. McKelvey, Northern College, Luther King
House, Brighton Grove, Rusholme, Manchester.

Rev. Professor J.S. McIvor, Union Theological College,
Belfast BT7 1JT.

Rev. Martin O'Callaghan, Trench House, St Mary's
College, Belfast BT11

Professor E. Nicholson, Oriel College, Oxford.

Rev. Vincent Parkin, Edgehill College, Belfast BT9 5BY.

Mr David Payne, 2 Westfield Ave., Watford, Herts.

WD2 4EB

Professor Jacob Weingreen, Trinity College, Dublin 2.

Subscriptions

Individuals £7.00 Sterling or £7.50 Irish Punts

Institutions £11.00 Sterling or \$20.00 US

All subscriptions should be made payable to "Irish
Biblical Studies" and addressed to the Editor.

IBS 13, April 1991

ESSAYS IN HONOUR OF REV. PROFESSOR J.M.BARKLEY MA. BD.
Ph.D.DD. ON THE OCCASION OF HIS EIGHTIETH BIRTHDAY.

(PART 2)

Edited by J. C. McCullough
W. D. Baillie

CONTENTS

- M. W. Dewar, The British Delegation at the Synod of
Dort: Assembling and Assembled; Returning and
Returning. 62-86
- Joseph Thompson, Repercussions in Ulster of the 1904-5
Revival in Wales. 87-105
- R. S. Tosh, Orders for the Sacrament of the Lord's
Supper in Irish Presbyterianism. 106-133

IBS 13, April 1991

THE BRITISH DELEGATION AT THE SYNOD OF DORT: ASSEMBLING
AND ASSEMBLED; RETURNING AND RETURNED.

M. W. Dewar.

"Sacrosancta Synodus Dordrechtii"

Wolfgang Meyer (Basel)

"The Christian World since the days of the Apostles has never a Synod of more excellent Divines, taking one thing with another, than this (the Westminster Assembly) and the Synod of Dort"

Richard Baxter

"I will live and die in the suffrage of that Venerable Synod"

Joseph Hall

"There I bid John Calvin goodnight"

John Hales

"What the Arminians held....? All the best Bishopricks and Deaneries in England"

George Morley

"Would to God I had never seen thee."

Matthias Martinus (Bremen)

THE DUTCH BACKGROUND

In 1610 the United Provinces, liberated from Spain, found their hitherto united Protestantism divided. A liberal school of Calvinists, disciples of Jacobus Arminius, presented a Remonstrance against the rigid orthodoxy of Gomar. The popular Calvinist Stadholder, Maurice of Orange, favoured the Counter Remonstrants. The Dutch oligarchy, led by Advocate Oldenbarnevelt,

were identified with the Remonstrant Arminians.

In 1618 the States General invited representatives of the Anglican and other Reformed, but not Lutheran, Churches in support of the Counter Remonstrants to a National Synod at Dort. James I and VI, unsympathetic to Puritans and Presbyterians in England and Scotland, sent five Episcopalians to represent him. Calvinists, though Erastians, they followed his eirenic and moderating advice.

The British Delegates were regarded as *primi inter pares*, maintaining the Episcopal position in an otherwise Presbyterian Synod; mediating between both parties; and indeed between Calvinists and Lutherans, whom they refused to disallow as not "Reformed".

The Synod's findings inevitably went against the Remonstrants. In Netherlands history "the Canons of Dort shot off the Advocate's head". In British theology John Hales was not alone in "bidding Calvin goodnight". Between Dort and Westminster (1643), another Theocratic assembly called by Erastian means, *Ecclesia Anglicana*, had moved from its earlier Calvinism to an Arminianism less liberal than that of the Remonstrants.

1618 - KING JAMES I : BOHEMIA AND HOLLAND

When the Thirty Years War began, Protestantism lacked an obvious "father figure". That position, once held by William the Silent, and paradoxically by Elizabeth of England, developed by default on their successors until the rise of Gustavus Adolphus. But the Stadholder Maurice, though now Sovereign Prince of Orange, was in the United Provinces only the servant of the States General. Oldenbarnevelt, the Advocate of Holland, was their chief executive. These two heirs of *le Taciturne* symbolised the dichotomy of the Dutch Republic. In Great Britain James I suffered no such limits to his sovereignty. Heir to Elizabeth in Church and State, he resisted Presbyterianism in Scotland, and Puritanism in England, as inimical to Monarchy. But a reaction from the Calvinian discipline of his youth had not entirely eliminated his sympathy for Calvinistic doctrine. (1) His contribution to the tragedy of 1618 was to support Maurice of Orange theologically at Dort,

rather than his own son-in-law, the Elector Palatine, militarily in Bohemia. In England, they were respectively known as "Grave" (Graaf) Maurice, and "the Palgrave" (Pfalzgraf).

"THE DILETTANTE THEOLOGIAN"

No Tudor monarchs took their titles of Defender of the Faith and Supreme Earthly Governor of the Church of England more seriously than King James (2). In Scotland and France, Calvinism tended towards rebellion. In the Netherlands it had played a major part in the Spanish War, in which Oldenbarnevelt had secured a twelve years' truce. Thus Dutch Calvinism enjoyed an almost unique quasi-Establishment position.

William the Silent's own brand had been moderate. His Coligny widow, Louise de Teligny, and her son, Frederick Henry, were known supporters of the Arminian Uytenbogaert, who had previously been Maurice's chaplain. The Arminians had the support of the Advocate, and their "High Mightinesses", the States General. Maurice was a soldier, not a theologian. It was said that he did not know if Predestination were "blue or green", but he did know that in Dutch "Spain" (Spanje) and "Orange" (Oranje) rhymed (3). This gave him standing with the militantly patriotic mob against Oldenbarnevelt and the oligarchy. What began as a dispute between the Leyden Professors, Hermensen (Arminius) and Gomar, ended in the division of Dutch Calvinism and a near schism between Church and State. The Synod of Dort was the closest to the Council of Trent that Protestantism was to know.

Uytenbogaert, a disciple of Arminius, had drawn up a Remonstrance against the strictly scholastic Calvinism of Gomar (1610). It seemed to him to exceed the Belgic Confession and Heidelberg Catechism, as well as Scripture itself, in its rigidity. Its chief issues were the five "Knotty Points", which had divided Pelagius from Augustine and would divide the Jesuits from Jansen, and Wesley from Whitefield. It had been presented to the States General through the Advocate who, with Hugo Grotius, was known to be Remonstrant in sympathy. But the majority of the Dutch Reformed

clergy, except in Utrecht, were Counter Remonstrant. This alignment between the quasi royalism of the House of Orange and strict Calvinism, and "Republicanism" and Arminianism, was quite the opposite of the English and Scottish situation. It seriously alarmed the King, who saw the similarity between himself and the egalitarian Puritans and the Stadholder and the "Erastian" Arminians (4). His "No Bishop! No King!" foreshadowed the later Dutch "*Oranje Boven*" ("Up Orange"). But his orthodoxy had been equally outraged by the appointment of another heterodox Professor to a Leyden chair (1611). This was Conrad Vorstius, whose heretical books were burned at Oxford, Cambridge, and St. Paul's Cross. He left the States, through his Ambassador Winwood, in no doubt that the heretic should have followed his heresies to the flames.

Seven years later a Dutch National Synod was called at Dort (Dordrecht) in the Province of Holland. The new British Ambassador, Sir Dudley Carleton, had been sedulously "stoking the fires" against the Remonstrants (5). The Stadholder had no authority to call the Synod, for which his supporters were pressing. That was the privilege of the States General, who were not as enthusiastic as the Counter Remonstrant clergy. But in June 1618 invitations were sent to all the Dutch Provincial Synods, as well as the other foreign Reformed Churches. These included France, Geneva, the Swiss Cantons, several West German States, Brandenburg and England. They were essentially Calvinist and "conformist" Churches. The Augsburg principle of *cujus regio ejus religio* was naturally as acceptable to Dutch Calvinists, as to all German Lutherans and Roman Catholics, although this was not confirmed until the Peace of Westphalia thirty years later. Louis XIII refused to allow the Huguenot nominees to leave France (6). The Calvinist Elector of Lutheran Brandenburg diplomatically did the same (7). In England the Dutch Congregations, previously represented at the Synods of their National Church, were prevented from sending delegates by King James' influence (8). He had a horror of Dissent, both at home and abroad, no less than that of Archbishop Laud in the next reign.

THE ENGLISH DELEGATION

The English Delegation was itself appointed by him and not by the Church. The Erastianism was characteristic of the English, though not of the Scottish, Church. The first four English delegates included a Bishop and two future Bishops. They were Dr George Carleton (not related to the British Ambassador), Bishop of Llandaff; Dr Joseph Hall, Dean of Worcester; Dr John Davenant, Master of Queens' College, Cambridge, and Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity; and Dr Samuel Ward, Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and Archdeacon of Taunton. Jacobean clergy have sometimes been dismissed as time servers, but these men bridged the gap between the Elizabethans and the Laudians with consistency and dignity (9). Writing of Archdeacon Ward over a generation later, Thomas Fuller's tribute could have included them all: "he turned with the times as a rock with the tide; and for his uncomplying therewith was imprisoned in St John's College in Cambridge. In a word he was counted a Puritan before these times, and Popish in these times, and yet being always the same was a true Protestant at all times." (10). As Elizabethans they were Calvinists to a man. But they were "Protestants", not "Puritans", not cavilling at ceremonies or "scrupuling" at surplices. John Whitgift, Elizabeth's favourite Archbishop, had set his seal on the Lambeth Articles (1595), which were a High Calvinist extension of the Thirty Nine Articles. James Ussher, Archbishop of Armagh, wrote the Irish Articles (1615), which passed almost verbatim into the Westminster Confession of Faith (1647) (11).

The delegation received their royal mandate at Newmarket in October 1618. They were urged to inure themselves fully into the Latin tongue, to show unity among themselves, to keep to Scripture and Anglican doctrine, to avoid controversial theology in the pulpit, to encourage the Dutch divines to do the same, to act as mediators between the disputants as well as between the Continental Confessions, ie Lutheran and

Calvinist, to keep in touch with him through his Ambassador, and to use moderation in everything. There is no doubt that the Delegation was faithful to the King's instructions in every detail. The two Cambridge dons, Davenant and Ward, were granted a further royal audience for two hours at Royston. They took their several ways to the coast, casually managing to miss the Dutch boat sent to fetch them over. Taking a later boat to Middelburg, they reached the Hague on October 27 in time for the Stadholder's reception (12).

THE SYNOD ASSEMBLING

On November 3 the Synod of Dort began. Like the Westminster Assembly, with which it has been compared by Richard Baxter, it was a Theocratic assembly convened by Erastian means (13). The next six months were a testing time for the varying loyalties of the Anglicans as Christians, Calvinists, and Episcopalians. This essay is not concerned with the intricacies of theology or of church government, but with the interplay of the Britons against the international background of this semi-Ecumenical Synod. Two other Englishmen played considerable parts at Dort, though not members of the British Delegation. Their position was not analogous to that of the Scottish Commissioners at Westminster, who so greatly influenced the Assembly. The Scots were "Assessors" only, with no voting powers. But William Ames and John Hales were not members of the Synod at all. The "ever memorable" John Hales of Eton was chaplain to the British Ambassador. His *Letters from Dort*, written to Sir Dudley Carleton, give as clear a picture of the background of the Synod as Robert Baillie's gossipy *Letters and Journals* of the Westminster Assembly. Hales's natural tolerance, and rational approach, modified his own Calvinism and also, perceptibly, the Counter Remonstrant sympathies of his master (14). On the other hand "Amesius" was one of those English Puritans who had found his spiritual home with "Dutch Divinity". His position at Dort was anomalous. As the only English Puritan present he was "employed" by the Counter Remonstrants to keep a watching brief over the deliberations. As an exiled

English Calvinist of Dutch Gomarist sympathies, he was *persona non grata* with the English court, even with the Calvinist Archbishop Abbot. Yet he continued Hales's work of reporting to the Ambassador when Hales, like Hall, had gone home. On one occasion he displeased Bishop Carleton by handing him some of his anti-Episcopal writings in a book of Grevinchovius, a Dutch co-religionist (15). Otherwise he seems to have maintained the English tradition of impartiality.

The Synod was divided into *Interi* (Dutch and Walloons) and *Exteri* (Foreigners). The former consisted of thirty-seven ministers, nineteen lay elders, and eighteen representatives of the States. There were also five Divinity Professors, including Episcopius, the chief spokesman of the Remonstrants. The *Exteri* numbered twenty-six. A painting by P. Weyts shows them in session, exactly representing a crude engraving in the official *Acta Synodi Dordrechtii* (1620), and also the Dort Medal. The members can be identified by their names and "Colleges". The meeting place was a secular, not a sacred building, but fitted with box-like pews for the delegates. The *Praeses* (Moderator) was John Bogermann, a Frisian from Leeuwarden, supported as "scribes" by Festus Hommius and Daniel Heinsius; both from Leyden, the storm centre of the controversy. They sat, with their "assessors", at the top of the hall; a long table for the Remonstrants ran down its length below them. The representatives of the States General were on their right, and the other Netherlands beyond them. The *Exteri* were on their left, from the British down to the Emdeners. Next to the favoured Anglicans were the empty seats for the French, which only served to emphasise the absence of the eirenic Pierre du Moulin of Charenton, and the "Huguenot Pope", du Plessis Mornay. Beyond them sat the Palatines. Below the bar of the house the general public, some four or five hundred of either sex were admitted. The Dutch shared with John Selden a passion for polemics, "coming as the Persians came to see wild asses fight" (16).

After the Synod had assembled and elected its

officers, the first official business was the taking of the Oath. In view of the harsh treatment accorded to the Remonstrants, it was afterwards suggested that an Oath was taken to condemn them unheard and out of hand. Although this seems to have been the policy of the Counter Remonstrant majority, it was not so stated in the Oath. It was indignantly denied as late as 1651 by Joseph Hall, who was always at great pains to defend the integrity of the Synod (17). Although the Remonstrants were "predestined" to defeat, and then their Articles soundly condemned, the British, the Bremeners and the Hessians tried to ensure that they received a fair hearing. But these "Colleges" were a minority among the *Exteri*, the most rigidly Gomarist being the Palatines and the Genevans. Years later the Independent John Goodwin was controverted by Bishop Hall on this very issue of discrimination against the Remonstrants, although he had not stayed to hear the most virulent attacks against them (18).

THE COMMENTS OF JOHN HALES

Before Episcopius and his party arrived, the Synod got through the more positive part of its agenda. This included the setting up of a Committee on the lines of the Hampton Court Conference, for the translation of the Bible into Dutch. Other preliminary discussions ranged from the propriety of illustrated and annotated Bibles to the baptism of the children of slaves ("Ethnicks") in the East Indies. But the entry of the Remonstrants was the *pièce de résistance* for which the Counter Remonstrants eagerly waited. Hitherto their only sympathisers had been a small group from Utrecht, who had the dangerous privilege of introducing them when they arrived on December 6, at the twenty-second session. It has not been lost on a modern Scottish historian that Episcopius's name is simply the Latinisation of "Bishop", which did not predispose later Scottish theologians to favour his views! (19) His opening speech was very eloquent and made a good impression on the English. It must be remembered that both parties were Calvinists, the Gomarists being stricter than the Arminians, who reserved the

Protestant right of private judgement and of protest (20). Their appeal to reason struck John Hales very forcibly. A member of Lord Falkland's Great Tew circle, like William Chillingworth, whose *Religion of Protestants* so antagonised the Westminster Divines, he was a man of latitude. His friend Anthony Farindon records that at Dort he "bid John Calvin good night" (21). It may be doubted whether John Hales had ever really bid Calvin "good morning". His Calvinism was probably no more than the contemporary Englishman's admiration for the fighting creed of the Continental Protestant at a distance. His change of heart is attributed to the "well pressing" of St. John III, verse 16, by Episcopius. This was the favourite Arminian "proof text", with its promise of Universal Salvation. But it seems more probable that this exposition was by Matthias Martinus of Bremen, the most liberal minded of all the *Exteri*, not excepting the Anglicans (22). Consequently John Hales reported, drily, to Sir Dudley that "Our Synod goes on like a watch, the main wheels on which the whole business turns are least in sight. For all things of moment are acted in private sessions. What is done in public is only for show and entertainment" (23).

The Remonstrants soon discovered that they had not been invited to a theological conference but summoned to a heresy trial. Kept under strict surveillance, they registered a protest against a "packed" house. They pertinently compared it with a *Lutheran* Synod sitting in judgement on *Calvinist* doctrine (24). This shrewd comparison was unanswerable, as the analogy was too close to be acceptable to the Counter Remonstrant majority. A letter from the Huguenot absentee, du Moulin, was read, urging that a Confession be drawn up to satisfy both Lutherans and Calvinists. But the Moderator only gave "fair words" and marked it "to be considered". Sir Dudley wrote to the Calvinist Archbishop Abbot that this "does ill suit with our business of suppressing the Arminians, and therefore it will not be thought fit to make mention thereof in the Synod" (25). George Abbot was always a shadowy figure at Lambeth, "caretaking" during this Calvinist

interlude between the strict Bancroft and the stricter Laud. He was approached by Bishop Carleton on behalf of the English on the vexed question of "Universal" or "Limited" Redemption, on which they were divided. The majority inclined to his own stricter interpretation (26). Later, having the misfortune to shoot a Hampshire gamekeeper, he remained in merely formal office till his death. His influence on the Delegation was, however, less strong than that of either the King or the Ambassador, although his chaplain, Dr Thomas Goad, was appointed to succeed Dean Hall.

THE DEPARTURE OF DEAN HALL

The sudden departure of the ablest of all the Anglicans has always had an air of mystery about it. He had readily accepted the invitation to "entertain" the waiting Delegation, with a sermon, declined by the more cautious Bishop Carleton. This "polite and pathological" sermon was well received, although it ended with an appeal to do away with the "ill omened" names of Remonstrant and Counter Remonstrant, Calvinist and Arminian, and to "lay aside all prejudice and party feeling that we may be happily united in the enjoyment of the common truth" (27). This was entirely in keeping with the King's counsel to "mitigate extremism" and to "promote unity". But within a fortnight Hales wrote that "Mr Dean of Worcester is very crazy and sickly of late and keeps his chamber, neither hath he been in the Synod some of these last Sessions" (28). By the New Year he had slipped away to the Hague. "giving notice to no man". Hales "wisht him an ill journey, for this discourtesy", but "hoped he had a good one" (sic) (29). In later years Bishop Hall was accused of feigning a diplomatic illness, and evading the controversies that would arise, and of accepting the Arminian conclusions (30). This was strongly denied in his correspondence with Davenant, by then also a bishop (31). It was not suggested at the time, when he took a graceful farewell, apparently *in absentia*, and was publicly thanked for his services. He was loaded with gifts, including a generous travel allowance, and the Dort Medal and chain, now the property of his old College

(32). In a lively passage Fuller noted that thirty years later ("What cannot God and good air do?") he had "gone over the graves of all his colleagues" (33). At Dort, as in Devon, Joseph Hall had a ready explanation for his sudden change of plan. In the late spring he was writing to Samuel Ward about the King's health, the Queen's funeral and his own "Hollandish distemper". Clearly his own and his Sovereigns' healths were of great interest to him (36).

THE ARRIVAL OF DR. BALCANQUAL

Unlike the Westminster Fathers, who worked ostentatiously over Christmas, the Dordracanists dispersed for the holidays on December 21. Holland on the eve of its golden age was very different from England of the Solemn League and Covenant. In this period, between the departure of Dean Hall and the coming of Dr Thomas Goad, another royal representative arrived in Holland. Compared with the enigmatic Walter Balcanqual, Joseph Hall seems positively opaque. But this is largely because later generations have misunderstood his position at Dort. Often thought to "represent the Church of Scotland", he was neither a member of it, nor a Presbyterian minister (37). The Scottish Church, under a pressure from King James, more subtle than that of King Charles and Archbishop Laud, was entering its Episcopal phase. But the younger Balcanqual, son of a strictly Presbyterian father, had no mandate from or to the Church of Scotland, either before or after Dort. Some writers have seen him as another Presbyterian in an almost Pan-Presbyterian Synod instead of a solitary Scottish Episcopalian forming a united British College with his English brethren (38). This confusion may be partly due to his "High Calvinism", which was equally shared by the Bishop of Llandaff and the Archbishop of Canterbury's chaplain (39). It was certainly not a Presbyterian prerogative in the early 17th Century. All the Westminster Divines were in Episcopal Orders, except for the two Huguenot Pastors of London, representing the Channel Islands in the Diocese of Winchester (40). Neither was "High Calvinism" then incompatible with

what was later called "High Anglicanism", as for example, Archbishop John Whitgift, who held to both. It is a mistake to read back modern ecclesiastical alignments into the Tudor and Stuart periods.

The confusion could also be due to a curious disclaimer by Sir Dudley to Archbishop Abbot of any "Undecency of apparel" on Dr Balcanqual's part; and a confirmation of the "general satisfaction" he had given (41). There is also an interesting note that a special box pew had to be built for him in front of the other Anglicans, throwing it out of symmetry with the rest. Weyts's painting shows a solitary beruffed and high hatted divine seated in front of the others. But his seat is now symmetrical with the stoves in front of the other Delegates' benches. Any divergence between Balcanqual and the other Episcopalians would have been on grounds of nationality, not doctrine or discipline. The Scottish Episcopalians, like the English, preached in black Geneva gowns. The Scottish Presbyterians wore cloaks of "Presbyterian true blue" (42) A graduate of both Edinburgh and Oxford (Pembroke College), he became Dean of Durham and later of Rochester. This was later held against him by the irrepressible Baillie, the Boswell of Westminster; "We have been much mistaken with that man; we esteemed him ever a Dordracanist, and opposed to Canterbury in that cause; but now we see he has made the King in his Manifesto print as much for the Arminians as the heart of Canterbury could wish." (43). By that time (1638) "Arminianism" had lost its original Dutch meaning of Liberal Calvinism, and was applied to anyone who leaned towards Episcopacy and Royalism. Similarly "Puritan" or "Calvinist" had come to mean anyone who opposed Charles I and Laud, however moderate his Churchmanship.

Balcanqual arrived just before the Christmas holidays, and Goad (replacing Hall) on January 19th. The latter's personality did not make itself felt as much as that of the other Britons. But there is little evidence to support the suggestion that Goad "turned Arminian" at Dort (44). He certainly "divided" for High

Calvinism with the Bishop and Balcanqual. His failure to obtain any substantial preferment on his return home may be due to his association with the "Unwanted Archbishop", George Abbot, whose chaplain he was. During these weeks the suppliant Remonstrants were brow beaten by "Mr Bogermannus", who shouted them down with his "*satis, sufficit*:" and "*Ite, dimittimini*." (45). The moderates, Davenant and Ward, who yet stood well with the Counter Remonstrants, were often engaged to confute the arguments of the Remonstrants. Of the other *Exteri* the Palatines, under Scultetus (Schultz), and the Genevans, under Tronchin and Diodati, were the most rigidly Predestinarian. The Bremeners, especially Martinus, and the Hessians, were even more moderate than the Britons, whose doctrine was the moderate Calvinism of the Thirty Nine Articles. But the British College seems to have been recognised as a *tertium quid* in the Reformed *diaspora*, neither wholly of the one or the other. One of the problems from which Dean's departure saved him was a stormy interview with Diodati, uncle of John Milton's friend and translator of the Italian Bible (45). A private session was also held in the Bishop's rooms to try to bring together the Universalist Martinus and the High Calvinist Gomar. They almost came to "apostolick blows and knocks to prove their doctrine orthodox." On another occasion when Bishop Carleton tried to mediate he was abruptly pulled up by Gomar, who insisted that the Synod was governed by "reason", not "authority" (46). This was interpreted by a Puritan historian to mean that he had no precedence at Dort except as a "baron of the English Parliament" (47). But the Synod seems to have felt that some apology was called for from "that old tuffe man" who had "silenced" the Bishop. But none was forthcoming, though he avoided him for some days. In spite of their undoubtedly privileged position, the Britons behaved with a singular lack of arrogance in a gathering overwhelmingly "foreign" and also "Dissenting" by their own insular standards. Apart from this one brush between the Bishop and Gomar, the Dutch seem to have accused them only of citing the least heretical writings of the Remonstrants (48). Unlike

Diodati, who preached weekly in Italian to a congregation of eight, they do not appear to have lapsed from their Latinity either (49).

In an intolerant age, when official Anglicanism at home was second to none in its fury against Recusants and Sectaries, the British Delegation abroad was marked by a sincere endeavour to find peaceful solutions rather than polemics. Refusing to condemn the Pope as "the Antichrist" but possibly as "an Antichrist" (50), they also refused to deny the name of "Reformed" to the Lutherans. (51) Though the Calvinists had been so styled for some forty years, this did not become formalised until the Treaty of Westphalia (1648) (52). For the matter of "Universal" or "Limited" Redemption Davenant and Ward were in favour of the former, while the other three followed Abbot's advice (53). When the *Confessio Belgica*, "le drapeau de l'Eglise Réformée Néerlandaise toute entière" came up for debate, the British made a dignified disclaimer for themselves against the "Dutch conceit" of "a parity of Ministers" (54). Dr Carleton saw no incongruity in sitting as a bishop among Presbyterians, but he did not regard it as in his mandate to vote for Presbyterian Church Government. He even claimed that the Dutch regarded Episcopacy as a possible antidote to their own "unhappy divisions" (55).

With the Remonstrants long since (January 21st) silenced by Bogermann's "powdering speech", forbidden either to leave the country or to enter the Synod, the last four months were occupied with endless disputations. After Easter the Canons of Dort, drawn up against the Remonstrants' Five Points, took their place beside the *Confessio Belgica* and the Heidelberg Catechism as palladia of Dutch Calvinist orthodoxy. They set the standard for High Calvinism, at home and abroad, for many generations, finding their place in the *Harmony of Protestant Confessions*. While joining in the condemnation of the Remonstrants' "error" the British and the Hessians led the other *Exteri* in refusing to condemn their persons as nationals of

another country (56). The five Britons found their way home, after spending a short holiday in the Dutch cities, which entertained them well, except for Leyden, the city of Arminius (58) Like Joseph Hall they had all received medals and chains, as well as a more generous table and travel allowance than the other foreigners, ie, £200 (for travel) and £10 (for daily expenses). To the honour of their Church and King they were not present at the public execution of Oldenbarnevelt, hitherto held in "close imprisonment" in the castle of Loevestein. The simultaneous triumph of a reactionary clericalism and a militant patriotism evoked from Diodati the grim joke that "the Canons of Dort had shot off the Advocate's head" (59) A year after this judicial murder of this elder statesman by "Grave" Maurice, his stepmother, the Dowager Princess of Orange, died at Fontainebleau; though she was buried with her husband at Delft. With Louise de Teligny died the last hope of Uytenbogaert. Episcopius, Grotius, and the rest found refuge in France, and ironically, in the Spanish Netherlands. Eventually returning to the United Provinces, they have remained in the homeland as a Remonstrant "Brotherhood". This is now affiliated to the World Alliance of Reformed Churches, where they rub shoulders with their *Hervormde* and the more rigidly orthodox *Gereformeerde* neighbours.

THE FATES OF THE BRITISH DELEGATES

In England the recently widowed, but not inconsolable, King saw his "Theologues" from an upper window and facetiously welcomed them as his "good mourners". Presenting their reports and the compliments of the Synod, they dispersed to their various duties and preferments. The Bishop was promoted to Chichester, Davenant became Bishop of Salisbury, and Balcanqual Master of the Savoy (60). Eventually Ward was appointed Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, and even Goad became Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation. In the final distribution of honours Hall, who had spent least time at Dort, was appointed to two Bishoprics. But on none of the British College did the Puritan storm blow more fiercely than on the author of

Roma Irreconciliabilis or "No Peace with Rome". An anachronistic survival of the Elizabethan age, Hall was an enigma to the *novi homines* of both Laudianism and the newer Puritanism. Charged with "Arminianism" (1628) he wrote pathetically to Bishop Davenant; "My Lord, you know I had a place with you (although unworthy) in that famous Synod of Dort, where (however sickness bereaved me of the hours of a conclusive subscription) yet your Lordship heard me with equal vehemency to the rest, crying down the unreasonableness of that way. I am still the same man and shall live and die in the suffrage of that Reverend Synod, and do confidently avow that those other opposed doctrines cannot stand with the doctrine of the Church of England." (61). This passage is often reproduced in a garbled version (62). It was one of the charges brought against Archbishop Laud that his chaplain, a Mr Tomline, had caused this passage to be suppressed in a later edition of Bishop Hall's *The Reconciler*. (63). Davenant replied: "as for the aspersion of Arminianism, I can testify that in our joint employment at the Synod of Dort you were as far from it as myself. And I know that no man can embrace it in the Doctrine of Predestination and Grace, but he must first desert the Articles agreed upon by the Church of England". So the two old Dordracanists corresponded, but they were already in a minority among the new Anglicans, and the new Puritans disowned them. Of the two survivors of Dort only Ward was summoned by the Long Parliament to the Westminster Assembly, and he refused to go. Of Hall, Fuller could later write: "Bishop of Exeter, then Bishop of Norwich, then Bishop of no place, surviving to see his sacred function buried before his eyes." (64)

The new "Arminianism" would emerge after the Westminster Assembly and the Commonwealth as Caroline "High Churchmanship", although that term was not in use till the turn of the century. When asked "What the Arminians held" Bishop George Morley of Winchester "pleasantly answered that they held all the best Bishoprics and Deaneries in England" (65). But as long as they lived Bishop Hall and Dr Mayer of Basel would compare Dort with "the heavenly city", and with "a most

holy place" (66). But Martinus of Bremen, with a longer stay there than Hall, used to say of Dort: "would to God I had never seen thee" (67) Something of this disillusionment entered England in the doggerel:

<i>"Dordrecht synodus, nodus,</i>	<i>"Dort's Knotty Synod,</i>
<i>Chorus aeger, integer,</i>	<i>Choir in ill condition,</i>
<i>Conventus ventus,</i>	<i>Windbag assembly,</i>
<i>Sessio stramen, Amen"</i>	<i>Heap of straw in session."</i>

But against this dismal picture of "boorishness" and Dutch intransigence may be set the British Delegation's eulogy by Davenant's nephew. Thomas Fuller, witty and wise, was himself a moderate Churchman in an immoderate age:

"In Carletono praelucebat episcopalis gravitas, in Davenantio subactum iudicium, in Wardo multa lectio, in Hallo expedita concinatio" (69)

"Carleton was preeminent in his episcopal dignity, Davenant for his breadth of judgement, Ward for his abundant power of discrimination, Hall for his fluent elegance of style".

Technically *multa lectio* could mean wide reading but the normal meaning of *lectio* is a reading, whether aloud or otherwise, rather than reading in the literary sense.

Perhaps an alumnus of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and of Blundell's School, Tiverton, may be allowed to credit with *abundant power of discrimination* the Master of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, which accepted Peter Blundell's offer of the Exhibition which Emmanuel had refused.

Joseph Hall seems to have had a genuine aversion from damp climates and difficult situations. Appointed by Lord Chief Justice Popham as the first Headmaster of Blundell's School, Tiverton, he had withdrawn, accepting the living of Halstead in Suffolk instead. He excused himself by saying "God pulls me by the sleeve and tells me it is His Will I should rather go to the east than to the west". He ingenuously added "I never meant other than to pass through this western school to

it; but I saw that God who found me ready to go the further way about, now called me the nearest and directest way to that sacred end" (70) This may seem an example of *the fluent elegance of style* with which "Worthy Mr Fuller" credited him; but it has not prevented the Devon school from claiming this future Bishop of Exeter as its first Head Master.

BETWEEN DORT AND WESTMINSTER

In the next generation, and with the coming of Arminianism to England, *Ecclesia Anglicana* was no longer regarded as the natural mediatrix among Protestants: while the term "the best Reformed Churches" seemed deliberately phrased to exclude her (71). Had she imperceptibly, no less than the Ever Memorable John Hales, taken leave of Geneva theologically as well as ecclesiastically? Certainly the wheel had turned full circle since Thomas Cranmer and John Calvin bid each other "good morning" in 1552 (72).

But the British Delegation at Dort still speaks to the Churches after nearly four centuries in yet another example of Joseph Hall's *expedita concinatio*. It derives from his "polite and pathetical" pre-Synod sermon. "We are Christians. We are one body: let us be of one mind. By the awful name of God, by the gentle bosom of our common Mother, by your souls, and by the sacred bowels of Jesus Christ - our Saviour's brethren - I intreat you to be at peace. So lay aside all prejudices and party feeling, that we may be happily united in the enjoyment of the common truth. "(73)

But like James Ussher, Robert Leighton, and Richard Baxter, these men were bound to be misunderstood. For such transgressors of contemporary ecclesiastical fashions the way must always be hard.

NOTES

NOTE OF GERHARDT BRANDT'S HISTORY (1677-1704, 4 VOLS.)

The son of a Remonstrant Minister, who was the biographer of Arminius, Gerhardt Brandt's (d.1685)

History is still regarded as a standard work. translated into French (1726) and English (Chamberlayne 1720-23), there is also a two volume English Abridgement (1725), and a summary in Volume I (1778) of John Wesley's *Arminian Magazine*.

NOTE A

"The instructions given from the King to our English Devines"

Our will and pleasure is that from this time forward upon all occasions you inure yourselves to the practise of the Latin tongue that when there is cause you may deliver your mindes with the more readiness and facility.

You shall in all points to be debated & disputed resolve among yourselves beforehand what is ye true state of ye question & joyntly & uniformly agree therupon.

And if in debating of the cause by the learned men there, any thing be emergent wherof you thought not before, you shall meete & consult therupon againe, & so resolve among yourselves joyntly what is fit to be maintained. And this is to be don agreeable to the scriptures & the doctrine of the church of England.

Your advise shall be to those churches that their ministers do not deliver in the pulpit to the people these things for ordinary doctrines which are the highest points of schooles, & not fit for vulgar capacity, but disputable on bothe sides.

That they conform themselves to ye publick Confessions of the neighbour reformed churches, with whom to hould good correspondence shall be no dishonour to them.

That if there be maine opposition betweene any who are overmuch addicted to their owne opinions, your endeavour shall be that certaine positions be moderatly layed down, which may tend to ye mitigation of that on both sides.

(Exeter College, Oxford, MS 48, folio 1)

NOTE B

THE SYNODICAL OATH

"I promise before God, whom I believe and worship, as here present, and as the Searcher of the Reins and Heart, that during the whole course of the Transactions of this Synod, in which there will be made an Enquiry into, and Judgment and Decision of, not only the well known Five Points, and all the difficulties resulting from thence, but likewise of all other sorts of Doctrines, I will not make use of any kind of human Writings, but only of the Word of God, as a sure and infallible Rule of Faith. Neither will I have any other thing in view throughout this whole Discussion, but the Honour of God, the Peace of the church, and above all the Preservation of the Purity of doctrine, so help me, my Saviour Jesus Christ, whom I ardently beseech to assist me in this my design by His Holy Spirit."

(GB op cit p 62)

NOTE C

THE DORT MEDAL

"The Dort Medal is gold, with a thick ring attached to it. It is somewhat larger and much thicker than a crown piece. On one side it has a mountain, with a circular temple (like the Tivoli Temple) on the top, over which is the word in Hebrew characters *Jehovah*, with a "glory" under it. At the four corners, in the shape of a St Andrew's cross, are the four winds proceeding in visible blasts from four faces. the legend around the edge is *Erunt ut Mons Sion* CMC XIX. On the reverse is a representation of the Synod. A long hall, with open arched roof, with beams stretching across it. There are three rows of benches or pews, filled with figures on each side. A table and canopied raised seat at the further end. Down the centre runs a long table with figures seated. At the nearer end there is a quadruple row of pews, divided by a bar or door, and outside this bar, figures of men standing, and a dog. All, or nearly all, the figures are wearing high hats. Legend *RELIGIONE ASSERTA*. On the two sides of the doorway, on

the cancelli, are the figures 16 and 19."

(From G. Lewis, Life of Joseph Hall, 1886, p.213)

The medal and the painting, by Weyts, are identical in detail. The medal, from Emmanuel College, is on permanent loan to the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge.

NOTE D

THE ALLEGED "ARMINIANISM" OF THOMAS GOAD

The DNB statement that Goad "went over to the Arminians" seems to be based on J.S. Brewer's extension of a footnote in his (1845) edition of Fuller's Church History (Vol v p475). It reads: "Like Hales of Eton...Dr Goad shortly after abandoned the High Calvinist party and went over to the other side. These effects may be attributed not only to a more careful discussion on the subject, but also to....Episcopius... See a treatise by Dr Goad...entitled "A Disputation, partly Theological, partly Metaphysical, concerning the Necessity and Contingency of Events in the World in respect of God's Eternal Decrees written above twenty years since", and published in 1661." It was reprinted in "a collection of tracts concerning predestination and providence and the other points depending on them" at Cambridge in 1719. Goad's is a short piece, but it must be the source for Brewer's and the DNB's allegation of "Arminianism".

This "Disputation" is described by its 18th Century editor as "the only remain that I know of that learned Divine, whose name is prefixed to it. This our Reverend Author was one of the most eminent (sic) Divines at the Synod of Dort, when the subject matter of the ensuing Disputation, and matters of the like nature, amongst the controverted points, were in dispute.... whether our Author was then of that judgement, which he declares in this Disputation, I am not certain. However, if his after thoughts which commonly are the best, inclined him to the Truth, and swayed his belief, we have reason to bless the God of Truth for the discovery". (p.359)

Since the "Disputation" was not rediscovered till

a century after Dort, and was not written till some twenty years before its publication in 1661, it need not prove that Goad "turned Arminian at Dort" ; though possibly in the generation after it, when the whole picture of English Church life was changing. It can hardly be advanced as evidence for his lack of preferment under either James I, or Charles I. Fuller, in fact, cites his return to Abbot's Chaplaincy as a preferment.

NOTE E.

Signatories of the British College, May 1619.

Ex Magna Britannia

Georgius Episcopus Landavensis.

Johannes Davenantius, Presbyter; Doctor ac Sacrae Theologiae publicus Professor in Academia Cantabrigiensi et Collegii Reginalis ibidem Praeses.

Samuel Wardus, Presbyter, SS Theologiae Doctor, Archidiaconus Fauntonnensis (sic) et Collegia Sidneyani in Academia Cantabrigiensi Praefectus.

Thomas Goadus, Presbyter, SS Theologiae Doctor, Cathedralis Ecclesiae Paulinae Londoniensis Praeceptor, Vice Joseph Hall (Aegrotat).

Gualterus Balcanquallus, Scoto-Britannus, Presbyter, S Theologiae Baccalaureus.

(P. Schaff, History of the Creeds of Christendom, iii, (1931, 6th editon) p. 378.

REFERENCES

1) J.L.Von Mosheim, *Eccles.Hist.* (Murdoch), (1845) iv p229

W.Barlow, *The Summe and Substance of the Conference at Hampton Court* (1604) pp 80,83.

2) W. Goeters coined the phrase *Dilletante-Theolog* in his *Die Verberectung des Pietismus* (Leipzig,1911)

3) J.R.Motley, *John of Barnevelt*, (1875) i p395 (note)

4) P Heylin, *Hist. of the Presbyterians* (1672) p 397. The Remonstrants must be regarded as Erastians, since they accepted the authority of the States, while their opponents accepted the Theocracy of the clerical Synod.

- 5) J Hales, *Letters from Dort* (Golden Remains), (1673) p304
- 6) G Brandt, *The History of the Reformation in and about the Low Countries*, (1723) iii p6 (v Note C, p.27)
- 7) E G Léonard, *Histoire Générale du Protestantisme*, (Paris, 1961) p.219 GB op cit p.7
- 8) H H Kuyper, *de Post Acta*, (Amsterdam, 1909) pp 208-13. They were Emden (1571), Dort I (1578) and Middleburg (1581)
- 9) T F Kinloch, *The Life and Works of Joseph Hall*, (1951) p.142
- H R Trevor Roper "King James I and his Bishops" (History Today, Sept 1955 pp.571-581)
- 10) T Fuller *Worthies of England* (1662) i p.299
- 11) cf Philip Schaff, *A History of the Creeds of Christendom* (1877) p.761
- 12) T Fuller, *Church History of Britain*, (1868) iii pp.308-309
- 13) Orme, *Life of Richard Baxter* (1830) p 69
- 14) J H op cit pp 72, 178, cf. B Brooks, *Lives of the Puritans* (1813) II pp.403-408
- 15) J H op cit p.53
- 16) The Assembly Man (Harleian Miscellany v p.99)
- 17) Daniel Neal, *History of the Puritans* (1733) ii, pp.113-114 cf. Note B.
- 18) John Goodwin, *Redemption Redeemed* (1651) p.395
- 19) A L Drummond, *The Kirk and the Continent*, (1956) p.119
- 20) H D Foster, *Liberal Calvinism, the Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort* (Harvard Theol. Review, 1923)
- 21) J H op cit Introduction np. G B op cit iii p.20
- 22) J H op cit p.92
- 23) J H op cit Introduction np.
- 24) G B op cit ii p.70
- 25) J H op cit p.178
- 26) J H op cit p.182-184
- 27) *Acta Synodi Dordrechtii* (1620), p.47
- 28) J H op cit p.53
- 29) J H op cit p.67
- 30) G Brandt op cit p.308
- 31) *vide infra* footnote 61
- 32) *vide supra* Note C (the Dort Medal)

- 33) T Fuller op cit p.312
- 34) J Jones, *Memoirs of Bishop J Hall* (1826) p.67
- 35) *ibid.*
- 36) G Goodman, *The Court of King James I*, (1822) ii p.194-196
- 37) G D Henderson, *Scotland and the Synod of Dort* (Nederland Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis, XX, iv p.6)
- 38) J H op cit, p.72, cf. F Calder, *Memoirs of Episcopus* (1835) p.365
- 39) J H op cit pp.179-181
- 40) M W Dewar, *The Synod of Dort, the Westminster Assembly & The French Reformed Church* (Proceedings of the Huguenot Society of London, 1967)
D Neal op cit ii p.61
- 41) J H op cit p.178
- 42) S Butler, *Hudibras*, line 191, cf. A P Stanley, *Lectures on the Church of Scotland* (1872) p.144
- 43) J H op cit p.84
- 44) e.g. DNB (But see Note D)
- 45) G B op cit p.70, cf. also P Geyl, *The Netherlands in the 17th Century* (1961) i p.70
- 46) J H op cit pp 112, 117 *non auctoritate sed ratione*
- 47) D Neal, *History of the Puritans*, (1736) iii p.96
- 48) G B op cit p.220
- 49) G B op cit p.227
- 50) G B op cit p.284
- 51) G B op cit p.282
- 52) *Treaty of Westphalia Article VI (i) "Qui Vocantur Reformati"*
- 53) G B op cit p.217
- 54) G Carleton, *Examination of the later Appeal* (1626) pp.111-112
- 55) G Carleton, *Examination of the Appeal* (1626) p.29
- 56) G B op cit p.281
- 57) G B op cit p...300-307
- 58) T F *Church History*, p.314
- 59) G B op cit p.371
- 60) T F op cit p.316
- 61) J Hall, *The Reconciler* (1629), pp.74-75. (For Davenant's Reply pp.84-85)
- 62) e.g. D Neal op cit p.116
- 63) W Laud, *The History of his Tryall and Troubles*

p.353 ("they say some passages against Arminianism were left out of two letters, one of Bishop Davenant's and the other of Bishop Hall's, sent to be printed")

64) T F Worthies of England (1662),p.13

65) Life of Edward, Earl of Clarendon (Oxford,1761) i p.50

66) G B op cit pp.204,230

67) G B op cit p.283

68) D Neal op cit p.117

69) T Fuller,Worthies of England,(1662),p.304

70) J Jones,Memoirs of Bishop J Hall (1826),p.67

71) The Solemn League and Covenant, The Confession of Faith, etc.(Edinburgh,1874) i p.226

72) Letters Relative to the English Reformation, Letters xiv,cccxxxvii (Parker Society,1847)

cf.P Lake,Anglicans and Puritans, (1988),p.24

cf.D MacCullough,Arminius and Arminianism (History Today,Oct 1989) pp.31-33

73) T F op cit p.299

The Rev. Canon Dr. M.W.Dewar M.A. (Cantab), Ph.D. (Q.U.B.)was a student of Professor J. M. Barkley. He was examining chaplain in Church History to three bishops of Down and Dromore and was elected to a canonry of St. Patrick's National Cathedral, Dublin. He is living in "active retirement" in Cheltenham, having served 37 years in the Church of Ireland.

REPERCUSSIONS IN ULSTER OF THE 1904-5 REVIVAL IN WALES

Joseph Thompson

Revival as particularly exemplified in the 1625 and 1859 revivals is a subject to which Dr. John M. Barkley gave attention in his book, "A Short History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland". In the early days of Presbyterianism in Ireland he records the story of God's moving in revival in this way.

The first Presbyterian ministers in Ireland, as we have seen, entered into a none too promising field, but God blessed their labours, and this resulted, in 1625, in the Six-mile Water Revival, which spread throughout a great part of Antrim and Down. God's chosen instrument was the godly but eccentric Rev. James Glendinning, of Oldstone. He preached the terrors of the Law with such force that the careless were aroused, and many were "prostrated" by a conviction of sin. Neighbouring ministers came to Glendinning's assistance. Finding that while he could preach the terrors of the Law he could not expound the Gospel of the love of God, they reformed the work in harmony with God's redemptive purpose, and rooted out the excesses and abuses. (1)

In order to build up the converts in knowledge and grace, the Antrim Meeting was formed, when people gathered on the first Friday of each month. Four sermons were preached in the morning and in the afternoon to help converts in their understanding of the Faith, and in the evening the ministers informally discussed and arranged the affairs of the Church. This Antrim Meeting became instrumental in the supply of Gospel ordinances in many areas.

Concerning the 1859 Revival, he quotes the opinion of J.E.Davey (2) as a fair minded summary. He himself

compresses an amazing amount of material in an article in a newspaper article (3) in 1959. In this, he argues for a deepening of spiritual life for some ten to twenty years prior to 1859, and discusses "prostrations", "number of converts", results both positive and negative. He concluded "We, in 1959, ... can best celebrate the centenary of the Revival by praising God for its blessing, by learning the lessons of the past, and by praying for the renewal of the Holy Spirit".

Biblical emphases from these two revivals might be summarised as follows: that there was strong preaching of the terrors of the law, which resulted in conviction of sin, and especially in 1859, in the assurance of salvation, that the gospel of the love of God which was in harmony with God's redemptive purpose was proclaimed, and that converts would be built up in knowledge and grace so that God's people might be more effective in their service for Him.

It is interesting to note that the quotation mentioned above from J.E. Davey relating to the 1859 Revival extends it to the Moody period. It reads thus, "the wave and enthusiasm it begot were renewed some fifteen years later when Moody and Sankey visited Ulster, and a second wave of revival swept through the land, to be renewed yet later by a second visit". From what we have previously cited regarding the 1625 and 1859 Revivals and the latter's extension to the end of the nineteenth century it is reasonable to argue that the subject of Revival receives fair treatment from J.M. Barkley. The subject of this essay - "Repercussions in Ulster of the 1904-5 Welsh Revival" - follows in the next decade after the Moody era.

GLAD TIDINGS FROM WALES

In 1905, The General Assembly received this report from the Rev. Dr. Charles Davey,

"Of the reports received from Presbyteries and Synods not a few betray a consciousness that there has been a special movement of the Spirit of God not far away. It is not that they have much to say on their own account of the workings of this great

Divine Agent. But it is something to have had it brought home to us in such a way as the reports indicate, that there is a spiritual power outside ourselves, available for our help and all sufficient that this power is operating now in a striking and gracious manner almost beside us. The thought has given birth to hopes that struggle for expression here and there. Were not some of us beginning to be a little uncertain about the supernatural? Would God ever come again to His Church as He is said to have come in her past history? Would the cry for mercy and the shout of victory be once more heard within her? Some were doubtful. We have had the answer in a manner that cannot be mistaken. And already some are on the mount in prayer; and some are looking towards the sea for the rising of the cloud, the precursor of the heavenly rain that is to put an end to the drought". (4)

How thrilling it must have been both to read the report of the Welsh Revival and to hear Dr. Charles Davey speak of it. The hearing of the "glad tidings from Wales" was in itself a repercussion of the revival. We need to look a little more closely at what was happening in Wales. Of necessity, this will only be the barest outline.

The story of the Welsh Revival has been ably and critically recorded in the last twenty years by Dr. Eifian Evans and Dr. J. Edwin Orr, (5) the former within the context of revival in the "land of revivals", and the latter within the context of a twentieth century world revival. Of the theological state of Wales at the time, it might be said that there was a tension in the Church between theological liberalism evidenced in "higher criticism", and a longing for the prosperity of evangelical religion evidenced in the adherence to the "fundamentals of the faith". In this general theological background the Revival came in 1904. It is generally accepted that the main human instrument was EVAN ROBERTS. As a young teenager he was challenged by something said in a

fellowship meeting by one of the elders: "Remember to be faithful. What if the Spirit descended and you be absent? Remember Thomas! What a loss he had!" From that moment, Roberts determined to be faithful to the means of grace and to pray for the Spirit, and that solemn vow was adhered to for the next twelve years. By the end of 1903, Roberts, aware of a constraint to preach, left the coal mines, where he had worked from before he was twelve, and began to prepare himself for the ministry. This time was both a time of intellectual preparation and also a time of spiritual preparation. Through Rev. Seth Joshua (who was to address the Irish Presbyterian General Assembly, but because of illness, was unable) Roberts entered into a fuller and deeper consecration through a prayerful desire for God to "bend him". In an awesome description of this encounter between a soul and God we are given a glimpse of a man crying to God, "Bend me! Bend me! Bend us! Oh! Oh! Oh! Oh!" In this state Roberts was aware that it was God's love which bent him, of the fearful bending of the judgement day and the need of the salvation of the human soul. "I felt", he related, "ablaze with a desire to go through the length and breadth of Wales to tell of the Saviour, and had it been possible, I was willing to pay God for doing so." (6) This experience of that "most terrible and sublime day" of his life was not only compelling, it was inescapable.

From college Roberts came home to see his home ministers in Loughror and its daughter church in Gorseinon. He felt that he was under a deep constraint of the Holy Spirit, and so we find him telling his brother-in-law: "I have a vision of all Wales being lifted up to heaven. We are going to see the mightiest Revival Wales has ever known - and the Holy Spirit is coming soon, so we must get ready... Do you believe that God can give us one hundred thousand souls now?" His home ministers gave him permission to start a youth meeting after the prayer meeting. Thus this mission commenced in an after meeting with only 17 present. He recounted his recent experiences and visions and called upon all to make public profession of Christ and to prepare for the baptism of the Holy Spirit. During a

long and protracted appeal all present submitted and this initial triumph was the first fruits of the 1904 Welsh Revival. Dr. J. Edwin Orr wrote of this mission; "It is an established fact that he believed this to be the beginning of a movement which would win a hundred thousand people to vital Christian faith, in the little principality of Wales alone - not to mention its impact farther afield"(7). The revival from this point spread throughout Wales. It was very widely reported in the secular as well as the religious press. This also obviously helped to spread the knowledge of it, which in turn brought visitors to see for themselves. Included in the visitors were ministers from Ireland, e.g. Rev. Dr. R.B. Wylie of Terrace Row, Coleraine and Rev. R.M. Kerr (Methodist)(8) and these in turn reported back to meetings in Ireland.

What of RESULTS? We will cite those quoted:- (i) A great number of conversions - over 100,000 (ii) Devotional results may be cited, e.g. prayer meetings, Bible study, Family altars, (iii) Great changes in morals and honesty and a decline in the consumption of alcohol, (iv) A decrease in crime, (v) A fresh concern for the salvation of souls, (vi) Greater attendances at church services, (vii) Payment of debts, (viii) Many of the converts were willing "to do anything and everything for the glory of their Redeemer" (9).

What were the BIBLICAL EMPHASES? First, those doctrines characteristic of periods of revival were evident, viz. sin, repentance, faith, heaven, hell, judgement and the incredible love of God in Christ. In the second instance guidance by the supernatural became a feature for some, e.g. in the experience of Evan Roberts visions of the reality of Hell, Christ's victory over the devil and of the moon (10). Such were viewed as a fulfilment of Joel 2:28. Leading on from this, a third Biblical emphasis was the question of the Holy Spirit - the questions of the reception of the Spirit, the baptism of the Spirit, the fulness of the Spirit and the direct guidance of the Spirit. Consideration of this would involve Biblical exegesis and the historical interpretations akin to it as evidenced in the Wesleyan emphasis on sanctification,

the Keswick teaching, and subsequent development of Pentecostalism. Fourthly, an emphasis on prayer, which also included repetitive ejaculatory prayer as the Spirit's simple instrument. A fifth consideration is that the revival was trinitarian in its view of the Godhead. This may be seen in the report given to the Irish Baptist Assembly. "One felt on entering an overwhelming sense of the presence of God, while on every hand one heard the cry "O, that I were like Jesus!" Indeed, this magnifying of Christ was evident everywhere, being manifestly the work of the Holy Spirit." (11). These Biblical emphases provide ample scope for work!

Of the Revival, there were CRITICISMS that were contemporary and subsequent to the time. A Congregational minister, Peter Price, comparing the Roberts movement with one from his own church calling it "a sham...a mockery, a blasphemous travesty of the real thing." He was repudiating Roberts' claim to being under the sustained guidance of the Holy Spirit and also he dismissed the physical manifestations as sheer exhibitionism. As Dr. Eifion Evans commented, "Neither phenomenon was new in the history of the Church, and while the first implied the possibility of delusion, the second raised the question of excesses" (12). Supporters of the Revival rallied in defence of Roberts. Amongst those criticism which Dr. Eifion Evans cites is that "there was during the revival a culpable neglect of the divinely ordained instrument of preaching" (13).

Notwithstanding these and other criticisms, the overwhelming view was that the Revival in Wales would stand the test of time and eternity. These "glad tidings from Wales" were gladly welcomed in Ulster. The BAPTISTS heard their president say, "The Revival in Wales, like summer sunshine, is its own evidence" (14). The METHODISTS read in 1905 of a largely attended meeting of ministers in the Grosvenor Hall to make arrangements for special meetings for united prayer for the extension of the Welsh Revival to Northern Ireland (15). The CHURCH_OF_IRELAND read in their Gazette of the Church of England being "in full sympathy with all

that is best in the remarkable religious "revival" of the last few months." It goes on to quote that the Archbishop of Canterbury does not think that "there is any room for doubt as to the blessing which has attended the special evangelistic efforts in the London and Welsh counties" (16). Other sources could also be quoted, but let us hear as the PRESBYTERIANS heard the the Rev.Dr. R.B. Wylie of Coleraine urge prayer for Revival. He ended an article with a plea that upon the Irish Presbyterian Church, the power of God and the fire of God might come, "so that our song and our prayer should be, as often heard in Wales, 'Send the power. Send the power. Just now send the power'." (17) These quotations reflect two repercussions of the Welsh Revival in Ulster, viz. an earnest desire for it and that prayer would be the means, under God, of its outbreak.

TIMES OF REFRESHING

Refreshing Revival blessing, as we have seen, came to Wales in 1904. The question we must ask is, "What were the repercussions of the 1904-5 Welsh Revival in Ulster?" Before examining the evidence we might suggest some possible interpretations of this period, which we shall define as 1900 to 1910. In this period there were at least three evangelistic emphases:- (i) the Welsh Revival, (ii) a great number of evangelistic missions, and (iii) the celebration of the Golden Jubilee of the 1859 Revival. These emphases can be separately identified but they are inter-related. How has this period's evangelism been interpreted? On the one hand, it has been mainly interpreted, if at all, as a period of spiritual blessing or just as part of the ongoing life and work of the Church. This explains the lack of comment about it in the histories of Irish Presbyterianism by J.M.Barkley, J.E.Davey, R.F.G. Holmes, and in an essay, "Irish Methodism and Evangelism" by W.L. Northridge. Dr. J. Edwin Orr, who argues that in this period there was a world-wide awakening, judges that whilst the story of the Welsh Revival has been often told, "most Christian people, including scholars, have been unaware of the extent of the Awakening which followed in the English-speaking

world - in the United Kingdom, the United States, Canada, South Africa, Australia and faraway New Zealand" (18). This quotation introduces us to Orr's judgement and conclusion after a world-wide survey that there was a world-wide awakening at this time, and this constitutes on the other hand an alternative interpretation to the evangelism of this period. He wrote: "The worldwide Awakening of the early twentieth century came at the end of fifty years of evangelical advance, following outpouring of the Spirit far and wide in 1858-59 and in the sixties. Thus it did not represent a recovery from a long night of despair caused by rampant infidelity, as was the case in the days of Wesley. It seemed, rather, a blaze of evening glory. at the end of the Great Century." (19) The task before us is to judge, if we can, whether there was Spiritual Blessing or Revival in this area of evangelism in Ulster. To do this we need to briefly survey this period. We stated above that in this period there were three evangelistic emphases. (i) The Welsh Revival. That there were repercussions from Wales to Ulster we have already seen, but as to whether this Revival extended to Ulster we will defer judgement to our conclusion. (ii) Evangelistic Missions. In the period just subsequent to, and contemporaneous with, the Welsh Revival there was a hive of evangelistic activity, which also included the 1859 Golden Jubilee Celebrations. To list some of these gives some indication of their extent: Killymurris, Ballymoney, Clough, Buckna, Cloughmills, Belfast: Shankill Road Mission, Broadway, Assembly Hall with Rev. John McNeill, etc. Londonderry had much activity in prayer meetings, preparation services for winter's work in Carlisle Road and Great James Street Churches, and a week of prayer in Waterside. In 1907 there was a mission led by Rev. John McNeill in First Derry and in 1908 there were united services in Waterside and Ebrington Churches, Lisburn, Maguiresbridge, Magherafelt, Portglenone, Broughshane, Ahoghill, Duneane, Lylehill, Castlederg, Dublin. In 1908, the States of Religion Report indicated that they had supervised services in some thirty centres conducted by

our "own ministers". Added to this list, the Ballymena area had "Gospel meetings" all over the district in 1909, the Newry area had in 1910 many missions conducted by Mr. A. Irwin (B. & F. B. S.), all but three congregations in the Carrickfergus Presbytery had missions in 1908, and there was a remarkable number of evangelistic missions in the Donegal Presbytery in 1908. These various centres indicate the regular ongoing evangelistic work which was steadily going on in the Presbyterian Church. To these most probably others could be added as they certainly could in other Churches (20) and para-church evangelistic organisations like The Faith Mission (21). (iii) The Golden Jubilee Celebration of the 1859 Revival. This celebration involved commemorative rallies, special united services, e.g. Newry, and a commemorative Revival sermon was preached from almost all Presbyterian pulpits (22). In 1909 there were examples of Simultaneous Missions, e.g. Dublin Presbytery had services in all their congregations. It was reported that "the missions in country churches were held earlier and attendances were reported from 60 up to 200 in places where the average Sabbath attendances would be 20 to 40. City Churches had not as high attendances proportionately but they were none the less very good, and, in the estimate of the conveners, fully justified the effort to commemorate the Jubilee of the Revival of 1859" (23).

The striking uniform general judgement of the evangelistic work of this period is that it was very fruitful. In some cases, there was a very rich ingathering into the Kingdom and some of these particular places must be considered.

CULLYBACKEY is an example of a fruitful harvest amongst Presbyterians. The Minister, the Rev. William Corkey, was ordained in Cullybackey in 1904. He preached a carefully prepared exposition of Christian truth in the mornings, whilst in the evenings "he tried" he said "to give a warm evangelical message preaching the good news of Christ's salvation as earnestly as I could." (24) He had visited the Welsh Revival which no doubt added to his fervour. In 1907 a

deep yearning after God became evident in many people. Corkey began an exposition of Romans 1-8 and large crowds attended on a weeknight and there followed on Sunday evenings exposition of St. Mark and First Corinthians. Older members of the congregation began to conduct prayer meetings and at some of these found many eager and willing to accept Christ. Upon returning to the Manse, and recounting the events to his wife, he recalled that the Rev. Dr. John Stuart of Derry had once said to him: "A minister cannot start a revival, but if you feel the breath of God among your people, you should spread your sails". He was convinced that this was happening, and so on the following Sabbath he invited all who wished to take part in prayer to remain after the evening service. He was amazed at the response, and after explaining that he felt that there were many anxious about their souls, he invited any who felt moved to offer prayer for the work of God. "Thereupon followed a most marvellous succession of earnest prayers mainly from the younger members of the audience... I was now assured that there was an awakening in the hearts of the people." (25) From this followed:- many seekers after Christ especially amongst the young people, open air meetings, many gathered into a Sabbath Morning Bible Class; a new interest was shown in Church Services and young converts were invited to come to the Communicants' Class.. The memory of those days was handed down to the present writer some 65 years later; and remembered with great joy.

BANGOR provides an example of a United Mission in which the Methodist and Presbyterian Churches were involved. This mission continued for a number of weeks and was held in Hamilton Road Presbyterian Church and to it crowds flocked nightly, including a vast number of young people. Amongst the preachers was the Rev. R.K. Hanna of Whiteabbey Presbyterian Church, of whom it was said that he preached with power and acceptance and Mr Arthur Parke (Irish Evangelical Society). The Methodist Church was the centre for Children's meetings, Bible Readings on two afternoons per week, a Men Only meeting on Sunday afternoon; and also meetings for converts. It might be pointed out that this

arrangement was similar to the earlier Moody missions in Belfast. The Methodist Irish Christian Advocate reported: "During all these hours it is to be hoped that the revival influences now so prominent in Wales will spread and grow till the blessing is world wide. The ministers of the three Presbyterian Churches and the two Methodist Churches are joined in the glorious work, and the town seems to be a great deal the richer in spiritual awakening. Through the agency of the mission may the blessing continue till all have been reached in Bangor and to God we give all the glory." (26) We might note the unity evident in evangelism, the continuation of the Moody Missions, the awareness of the Revival in Wales and the fruitful harvest of converts.

TOBERMORE is the setting for our last example of very fruitful evangelism described as "a religious awakening" and "a tidal wave of revival." (27) This movement included Presbyterians, Baptists and the Church of Ireland, with the leader the Rev. F.C. Gibson. Gibson was ordained in Tobermore in 1905 and judging the village spiritually and morally dead, preached earnestly the gospel of repentance. His message was resisted and "absenteeism" from Church on the part of many was the result. Officebearers expressed their intention of leaving. During an illness Gibson came to the conclusion that Tobermore needed revival and that the fault lay with himself and Christian people. Thus was born a desire to work for revival. In his outlook was a mixture of thought which embraced Revival and Revivalism. Two interesting experiences - a dream about the cross, and his vivid sense of meeting Satan and defying him in the name of Christ - provide possible links with Evan Roberts' dreams and visions in Wales. Gibson, because of his battle with Satan, was convinced that Revival was coming.

To further his objective Gibson achieved unity and co-operation with the Church of Ireland rector and the Baptist minister, the Rev. George Marshall. Such co-operation with the Baptists was remarkable in that they were a secession from the Presbyterian Church,

with their minister the Rev. Dr. A. Carson, 'a century before (28). There was prayer preparation and area weekly gospel meetings in preparation for a special mission which lasted six weeks. Those who took part in the mission were Rev. Dr. John Stuart of Derry, Rev. Charles Davey, Rev. Dr. Thomas A. Smyth, Rev. Dr. R.H. Hamilton, Rev. William Corkey, and the Rev. William Witherow. The Meetings were free from extravagance and unhealthy sensationalism but in them there was an intensity of religious feeling. Individuals and the community at large were affected. Both inside and outside the Church men and women cried to God for mercy and were savingly converted. Gibson lists four noteworthy features of this Revival.

1. Practically all the meetings were conducted by our own, and most highly esteemed and richly gifted ministers.

2. The meetings were practically all held in Churches and people were converted in their own Churches and often in their own pew. Thus a new love for their Church was born.

3. The revival services were kept as near as possible to the ordinary services of the congregation where the meetings were being held.

4. The very personal part played by the ministers in their own congregations was not only noteworthy but crucial for the development of the revival. (29)

Without doubt, Tobermore in 1908 had a rich ingathering into the Redeemer's Kingdom. Christians, too, as the Baptist Minister George Marshall said, "received a great uplift". It had ties, to some degree, with Wales, e.g. dreams and the emphasis which Gibson noted as "the uplifting of Christ and him crucified", which emphasis had been specifically mentioned by Rev. Dr. D.A. Taylor in his account of the Welsh Revival to the Irish Presbyterian General Assembly in 1905 (30).

These three centres - CULLYBACKEY, BANGOR, TOBERMORE - are examples of a very rich spiritual harvest. We could cite others, including Manchuria (31), which is of Irish Presbyterian missionary interest, but space forbids. It is necessary to attempt to assess results in this "Time of Refreshing".

- (i) There was a steady ingathering into the Kingdom of God through conversion.
- (ii) Many lives were rededicated to Christ and from them the Christian leaders emerged.
- (iii) Some non church attenders were reached and brought to Christ. Some young fellows who were given to drinking on the Sabbath "are now seen going, with their families and friends, Bible in hand, to some place of worship" (32).
- (iv) Bible Classes flourished, especially in the Ballymena area.
- (v) Prayer was often married to Bible Study.
- (vi) There was Outreach evangelism through open-air meetings.
- (vii) Some places recorded great increases at Communion, and Tobermore Baptist recorded exceptionally large numbers of baptisms.
- (viii) The Temperance movement grew.
- (ix) Great growth of the Christian Endeavour movement in some places, e.g. after the Corkey Mission in Wellington Street, Ballymena, there was a phenomenal increase in the C.E. to a membership of 360. (33)

Viewing these results, it might be fairly claimed that this period 1905-1910 was indeed a "Time of Refreshing". We must now return to the question raised earlier - what were the repercussions of the 1904-5 Welsh Revival in Ulster? In answering this question we will examine reasons for stating that the Welsh Revival did extend fully to Ulster, and then consider why it might be argued that it did not, and from these two areas of examination attempt to seek a resolution as to what the repercussions were.

What has been presented thus far is relevant in an argument that Revival came from Wales to Ulster. In Lurgan, W.B. Sproule had no hesitation in saying that there had been "a real revival of religion" (34), in Cullybackey W. Corkey was convinced that Revival was taking place (35), and similarly F.C. Gibson in Tobermore, which J.E.Orr cites as a typical example of what happened in Ulster (36). It can be argued that the results, quoted above (37), in the ethos of the Unity of Christian people so evident in Revival, is a strong

case for Revival in Ulster in the twentieth century. Added to the three cited above, there could be mentioned the mission in Ballymena, conducted by William Corkey, in which there was, as an eyewitness described, "a spirit of Revival", and a host of other missions. J.E. Orr cites the resolution emerging from the State of Religion Report of 1909, "The Assembly records its devout thankfulness to the God of all grace for the many tokens bestowed on the Church as a whole, and several parts in particular, which reminds us in some measure of the marvellous Year of Grace, 1859. In these places the Spirit of God has been exercising His gracious agency in deepening the religious life of the people of God: in bringing to open decision the anxious and the enquiring; and in quickening the careless and godless. It is believed that no such spirit of earnestness has been manifested since the revival of '59" (38). These arguments, together with what has been stated above, constitute the case for Revival.

An alternative view to the case for the Welsh Revival extending as a full Revival is that this era was one in which there was extensive spiritual blessing in Ulster. The places cited as examples and proof of Revival may be accepted as places where spiritual blessing occurred. They can be viewed as particular revivals in defined areas which never were formed into a general movement. The Church at this time was not aware that there was a general revival, and many expressed this opinion (39). To the present writer it is inconceivable in a closely knit community like Ulster that a Revival was unknowingly progressing throughout the province. From such contemporary judgement, the argument for particular revivals is more convincing than that for a general movement.

As against this viewpoint of particular revivals, the host of missions, which can be cited from all Churches, argues for a wider movement and gives weight to this view of a general revival. It is both interesting and instructive to compare this period with that of 1885 when a similar situation existed, e.g. 235 evangelistic missions in one year, with much evangelistic activity and fruitful response. Of this,

the Rev. Dr. William Rogers stated, "If we cannot chronicle anything like what might be called a religious awakening, still we have to note in many parts of the Church the existence of great religious earnestness and the presence of much blessing. If we have not had the floods, we have had the showers" (40). It is at least arguable that the period 1905-1910 is not different as far as spiritual response was concerned from around 1885 and consequently that the judgement applied, without debate, for the earlier period applies also to the later one.

The wave effect of spiritual blessing moving from place to place can be illustrated from place to place, e.g. Cloughmills to Killymurris, but it does not appear to be the onward movement that is generally evident in Revival.

Again, whilst it is true that prayer increased in particular places, this claim must be viewed in the context of the decreasing number of prayer meetings - in 1900 there were 902 in Presbyterian Churches, whilst in 1914 there were 578. Whilst there were new communicants in goodly numbers, there was not an overall large increase in communicant membership in the Church. The same position applies to Sunday School scholars and Bible Class members. What can be argued for this period is that the evangelism of the period enabled the Church to hold her ground. Preaching constitutes a major difference between the Welsh Revival and the time of blessing in Ulster. There is no argument against Dr. Eifion Evans' judgement that there was a "culpable neglect" of preaching in Wales and visitors from Ulster reported this. In Ulster, the evangelistic services were centred on preaching and examples of this (with strong Biblical emphasis and content) may be seen in Tobermore and Ballymena, etc.

That the case for a period of Spiritual blessing as against that for a Revival is strong, will, to the present writer, be judged as plain. How do we resolve it?

That "much can be said on both sides" is a safe saying when faced with a dilemma, but yet resolution of this question is possible. Before finally seeking to do

this three additional things need to be mentioned. Firstly, a definition of what revival is and what is its extent needs to be reconsidered. To me, Revival is that which is comparable to that which took place in 1859 or 1625, but perhaps Revival could be defined as having taken place on a smaller area. My position has been challenged through reading the life of D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones. The following passage makes the point: "The same Holy Spirit as may be known by a single Christian is then 'outpoured' upon a multitude." (41) So a time of revival is a multiplication of divine grace. If this is the case then the rising tide of blessing in Lloyd-Jones' ministry in 1931 could understandably be called "revival". Is not perhaps here a key to an understanding of those who view that the blessing in Ulster in 1905-1910 was Revival? The present writer would argue for particular revivals. Secondly, the difference between Revival and Revivalism ought to be at least recognised. The latter trend runs through Moody, and then Torrey and Alexander in the period under consideration, to be followed by Chapman, etc. F.C. Gibson came to a Finney-type view of revival, that the fault lay not with God, but that the Church could work for it. Thus evangelism began to be called revivalism and an Evangelistic Campaign became a Revival Campaign. A recognition of this trend is valuable in judging what happened. Thirdly, the inter-action of the Golden Jubilee of the 1859 Revival commemoration with that of the Welsh Revival needs to be recognised. Consequently, the reporting of 1909 must be viewed very much in reference to this Jubilee, albeit influenced by the Welsh Revival, but not a direct result of it. With these three qualifications, how do we propose a resolution? Increasingly we view the discussion not as an EITHER-OR situation, but as a BOTH-AND one. With this comment let us formulate a resolution of our discussion:-

In this period 1905-1910 in Ulster, there were particular revivals in certain places, e.g. some would claim Tobermore, others Lurgan and others Cullybackey, etc. and simulataneously with them periods of spiritual harvesting due to evangelistic missions. Professor

George M. Marsden makes this comment of the years after the Welsh Revival; "In the years immediately following, sparks from the Welsh awakening seemed to kindle flames of revival around the world." (42) Some of those sparks ignited particular revivals in Ulster. There was no widespread Ulster Revival, but if someone takes the view that a particular revival is revival and that that substantiates the thesis that the Welsh Revival was extended in this way, the present writer would graciously disagree and still assert that there were both particular revivals and fruitful harvesting from evangelistic missions at this time. Disagreement as to how we describe these days of spiritual blessing is amongst friends. Whatever our disagreements, we would gladly sing that hymn of Bessie Porter Head, a recorder of some of the events of 1905:

O Breath of Life come sweeping through us,
Revive Thy Church with life and power;
O Breath of Life come, cleanse, renew us
And fit Thy Church to meet this hour.

O Wind of God, come bend us break us
Till humbly we confess our need;
Then in Thy tenderness remake us
Revive, restore, for this we plead.

Revive us, Lord! Is zeal abating
While harvest fields are vast and white?
Revive us, Lord, the Church is waiting
Equip Thy Church to spread the light.

1. Loc. cit., p.5

2. Ibid, pp.57-58 cf. Davey, J.E. The Story of One Hundred Years, pp 41-45.

3. Barkley, J.M. in Belfast Telegraph. Telegraph Capti
"Revival of 1859 was a planned operation".

4. R.G.A. 1905 p.57 cf. The Witness, June 13th, 1905,
Thompson J : "Repercussions in Ulster of the 1904-5
Welsh Revival" pp.44-56.

5. Evans E. The Welsh Revival of 1904 and Orr J.E.

The Flaming Tongues.

6. Evans, E. op.cit., p. 70.
7. Orr, J.E. op.cit., p. 7.
8. The Missionary Herald, May 1st, 1905, pp 106-7; Iris Christian Advocate 1905, p. 64.
9. Thompson, J. op.cit., pp 48-49, 51, 55-56.
10. Evans, E. op.cit., pp 77-81.
11. The Irish Baptist Magazine, 1905, p. 169
12. Evans, E. op.cit., pp 132-133
13. Ibid., p. 184 cf. Orr, J.E., Evangelical Awakenings in Southern Asia, p. 103.
14. The Irish Baptist Magazine, 1905, p. 112ff.
15. The Irish Christian Advocate, 1905, p. 61.
16. Church of Ireland Gazette, 28.4.1905. I am indebted to the R.C.B. Library, Dublin, for this information.
17. The Missionary Herald, May 1st, 1905, pp. 106-107.
18. Orr, J.E. Evangelical Awakenings, p. 103.
19. Orr, J.E., The Flaming Tongue, p. 187.
20. Methodist: Irish Christian Advocate, 1905 and following years, Daily Christian Advocate 23.6.1905, etc.; Baptist: Irish Baptist Magazine, 1900-1910, cf. Church of Ireland Gazette, May 1905 carries two articles on "Revival and religious apathy" by the Dean of Belfast.
21. Bright Words, 1900-1910.
22. M.G.A. 1909, p. 8433.
23. The Irish Presbyterian, Dec. 1909, p. 176.
24. Corkey, W. Glad did I live, p. 82.
25. ibid., p. 87
26. loc.cit. 17.2.1905, p. 84.
27. Irish Presbyterian, Mar. 1908, p. 46 and Irish Baptist Magazine, 1908, p. 96.
28. R.G.S.U. pp 385, 389, 411-12, 441, 446, 468. cf. Thompson J. "The inter-relationship of the Synod of Ulster and the Secession Synod", p. 370ff.
29. Gibson, F.C. "An Abundant Ministry", being diary extracts by his son, F.R. Gibson.
30. The Witness, June 13th, 1905.
31. Thompson, J. "Repercussions in Ulster", pp. 81-82.
32. The Irish Presbyterian, May 1909, p. 80.

33. Thompson, J. "Repercussions of the Welsh Revival", pp.83-84.
34. The Witness, 7th April, 1905; 13th June, 1905.
35. Thompson, J. op.cit., pp. 74-76.
36. ibid., p. 95. Orr. J.E. ibid., p.32; A.H.O.C., p.781.
37. In section on "Time of Refreshing".
38. Orr, J.E.: op. cit., p.31. Orr follows Gibson F.C. "An Abundant Ministry", p.12 cf. M.G.A. 1909 (2) p 843 for the first sentence. R.G.A., 1909, p.59 for second sentence. Location of third sentence unknown to writer.
39. The Irish Presbyterian, Jan 1909, p.1. cf. Gavan, I.R. Spirit of Revival, p.137. cf. Thompson, J., op.cit., pp. 96-97.
40. The Witness, 11th June, 1886. cf. Thompson, J. op.cit. pp. 97-98. cf. Thompson, J. "Aspects of Evangelization in Irish Presbyterianism", pp. 54-123.
41. Loc. cit. p.203; cf. pp. 214, 217, 225.
42. Marsden, G.M. Fundamentalism and American Culture, p.98.

The Rev. Joseph Thompson, B.A. B.D., M.Th., Ph.D. did his M.Th and doctorate on "The Inter-relationship of the Secession and the Synod of Ulster" under the supervision of Dr. Barkley. He was Honorary Secretary of the Presbyterian Historical Society from 1982 till 1991.

ORDERS FOR THE SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S
SUPPER IN IRISH PRESBYTERIANISM

ROBERT S. TOSH

Professor John M. Barkley has written: "The first Presbyterians in Ireland accepted as their standard for the ordering of worship and administering the sacraments, the Scottish Book of Common Order (1564)."

(1) The Book of Common Order authorised by the recently reformed Church of Scotland in 1564 had its origins in various continental Reformed Service Books - The Forms of Prayers and Ministration of the Sacraments etc., used in The English Congregation in Geneva (1556), itself based on Calvin's La Forme des Prières (1542) which drew heavily on Martin Bucer's liturgical usage in Strasbourg where Calvin arrived in 1538, having been expelled from Geneva. (2)

There has been much discussion as to the exact use BCO (1564) was put in Scotland but most liturgists would probably agree with A.C. Cheyne's conclusion that it "was valued as the expression and the safeguard of an actual unity, rather than as the means to be used for the creation of a uniformity not yet in existence. Though men honoured it, they could never regard its authority as ultimate." (3)

The Order for the Lord's Supper is as follows:

Prayer of Confession

Psalm

Prayer - Illumination

Sermon

Prayers - Thanksgiving and Intercession

The Lord's Prayer

The Apostles' Creed

Psalm - with preparation of the elements

Warrant or Institution

Exhortation

Prayer of Consecration

Fraction and Distribution

Prayer - Thanksgiving

Psalm

As Calvin desired to have weekly celebrations of Communion, the Liturgy of the Word was that followed at each Sunday Service. McMillan (4) has pointed out that "Nothing is said about the reading of Holy Scriptures", but arguing from Continental and later Scottish practice, he concludes that this took place before the sermon although it must be remembered that in post Reformation Scotland there had developed the custom of having the "Reader's Service", consisting of Psalms and Scripture readings, before the minister came to the pulpit. In an Irish context, J.S.Reid states that this was "the mode of commencing public worship customary to that period." (circa 1630) (5)

The structure of the Liturgy of the Faithful is identical with that of the Forme of Prayers (1556) as are the contents of the Exhortation which emphasises the benefits of the Lord's Supper, stresses the dangers of unworthy reception, lists those who are not to communicate and, in the final section, while clearly refuting transubstantiation again emphasises the Sacrament's benefit as a "singular medicine for all poor, sick creatures, a comfortable help to weak souls." No reference is made as to when the elements were to be brought in.

The Prayer of Consecration commences with Adoration, continues with Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption, refers to the Mighty Acts of Christ and to the Institution of the Sacrament, concluding with an Ascription of Glory. Although it contains none of the "time honoured words and phrases of the Western Liturgies", (6) it has a dignified and carefully expressed style.

No precise details are given for the fraction and distribution except that the minister was to break the bread, deliver it to the people who were then to distribute and divide it among themselves. The rubric also suggests that some suitable Scriptural passage, "setting forth the death of Christ", might be read at this point. There is no direction as to when the minister was to communicate. The conclusion to the Order is brief: a two sentence prayer of Thanksgiving, Psalm 103, still traditionally sung in many Irish

Presbyterian congregations, and the Blessing.

So far as practice in early Irish Presbyterianism is concerned, there is clear evidence that parishes often joined together for Communion, the people received the elements seated at tables, there were Table Addresses, the ministers communicated before the congregation and Services of Preparation and Thanksgiving were held. (7)

Little evidence however exists of the actual Order followed. It is quite clear from the writings of ministers like Robert Blair and of their opponents like Bishop Leslie that the Liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer was totally eschewed. It might seem reasonable to assume that as most of the ministers were Scots BCO(1564) would have been used but as Dr.W.D.Bailie points out:"Neither Blair nor Livingstone makes any reference to the Book of Common Order in their writings and any references to pulpit prayers suggests that these were not taken verbatim from it but were of a conceived or even extempore nature." (8) However, it cannot be automatically assumed that the absence of any references to BCO(1564) means that it was not used by other ministers. Nevertheless, whatever use may have been made of it, this would have been modified by at least four factors:

1. The first Presbyterian ministers were in an irregular position within the State Church having no formal supervision by Presbytery. Thus their freedom to order worship was increased.
2. The opposition, and indeed persecution, in the 1630s could have led to an increasing tendency to become more reluctant to use a service book. Just as in Scotland, the attempt to impose the 1637 Book of Common Prayer led in McMillan's opinion to almost total rejection of BCO(1564) for " it led to a prejudice against prayer books of all kinds", (9) so something similar may have occurred in Ireland.
3. During this period of chaos and persecution, leaving the people without ministers, made them, as Robert Bailie wrote resort to private services and meetings with the result that they were open to extreme Separatist influences in worship. (10) J.M. Barkley

qualifies the words quoted at the beginning of this stating that the use of the Book of Common Order was in Ireland "considerably influenced by Brownism". (11) Brownism was an advanced form of English Puritan Separatism and its followers rejected read prayers and the use of The Lord's Prayer and The Apostles' Creed. (12) That these Separatists were present in Ulster there can be no doubt, nor can there be much doubt that they did influence how Irish Presbyterians worshipped. Indeed Scottish writers like G.W. Sprott have tended to blame Ulster Scots returning to their homeland in 1638 for being instrumental in the degradation of worship in Scotland (13)) a gross overstatement for as A.C. Cheyne writes: "One cannot help noticing how often Scotland's religious controversialists have played to the gallery of nationalism as a means of commending their case. Episcopacy and liturgical worship are denounced by one party as an English importation or commended as a native growth; and so with Presbytery and extempore prayer." (14) Cheyne's words are perhaps applicable to Irish writers also; for the impression can be given that deviations from the forms of BCO (1564) occurred in Ireland only because of the influence of non-Presbyterians.

4. Early Presbyterian worship in Ireland was influenced by what might be called the spirit of revivalism. The Six Mile Water Revival of 1625 was marked by psychological manifestations, common to such phenomena, and an emotional atmosphere. No service book can be structured for occasions like that; indeed the way is open for the freer, less structured type of worship favoured by Puritan Separatists. W.D. Bailies concludes that the Six Mile Water Revival had "some detrimental effects upon the worship of the Church as set forth by the first Reformers." (15)

Exactly what use was made of BCO (1564) in early Irish Presbyterianism may never be known, in any case it was to be replaced in 1647 by the Westminster Directory for the Public Worship of God produced by the Westminster Assembly of Divines under the aegis of the English Parliament.

Professor Horton Davies describes the Westminster

Directory as "a compromise between the three parties, the English Presbyterians, the Scottish Presbyterians and the Independents".(16) Certainly, there was heated debate between the parties about specific points and especially the directions for the celebration of Communion. One of the Scottish Commissioners, Robert Baillie, complained that the Independents "mangled" the Sacrament especially in their lack of preparation and thanksgiving. He criticised the fact that they had "two short graces over the elements, which are distribute and participate in silence". Baillie also objected to the Independent practice of "carrying of the elements to all in their seats athort the church".(17) The Westminster Assembly debated this particular point for a number of days before a compromise formula was reached that the communicants should sit "around" the table or "at it".(18) Significantly in its Act of 1645 adopting the Directory the Scottish General Assembly took pains to insist that the communicants should be seated at the table.(19)

The Liturgy of the Word in the Directory, as in BCO(1564), was identical with the Order of Service to be followed at each Sunday Service:

Call to Worship

Prayer of Adoration and Invocation

Scripture Readings (from both Testaments)

Psalm

Prayer of Confession and Intercession

Sermon

Prayer of Thanksgiving

The recitation of the Apostles' Creed is not included and the use of the Lord's Prayer was permitted after the Thanksgiving. This was followed by an Exhortation in which the minister was to describe the "ends and uses" of the Sacrament, stress the need for worthiness and to warn of the dangers of eating and drinking judgement. Yet this was to be balanced by an assurance to all who were conscious of their sinfulness that at the Lord's Table they would find "ease, refreshing and strength to their weak and wearied souls." The rubric continue that the minister is to begin the action with "sanctifying and blessing the

Elements of Bread and Wine set before him". The wording gives no indication as to when the elements were to be placed on the table - either at the start of the entire service or carried in at this point. Before the words of Institution, the minister was to state that the elements "otherwise common are to be set apart and sanctified to this holy use, by the Words of Institution and Prayer." Thus no one particular moment could be considered that of Consecration.

The Prayer of Consecration begins with thanksgiving for all God's benefits, for Redemption and for all the means of grace and in particular, the Lord's Supper. An invocation that God would "vouchsafe His gracious presence" is followed by the epiclesis that God's presence and the effectual working of His Spirit might, "sanctify these Elements both of Bread and Wine, and to bless His own ordinance, that we may receive by faith the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, crucified for us, and so to feed upon Him, that he may be one with us and we with Him; that he may live in us, and we in Him and to Him who hath loved us and given Himself for us." (20)

In 1692, the "Father of American Presbyterianism", the Irish born Francis Makemie replied to the charges of the then Quaker, George Keith, that the epiclesis implied a Popish Consecration: "All we do is only pray to God for a Blessing on the Elements: that God would be pleased to vouchsafe His Gracious Presence and sanctify the Elements of Bread and Wine, making His own ordinance Effectual for the Spiritual Nourishment of Believers: and as we eat Bread and drink Wine, so we may feed by faith and spiritually upon Jesus Christ and what Popery is here, let the World judge." (21)

Commenting on this part of the recommendation in the Directory, Dr. W.W. Porter a contemporary Irish Presbyterian writer states: "A close regard to what the Westminster actually said will show that their prayer was for the ORDINANCE i.e., for the use to which the elements would be put and not so much for the elements themselves." (22) Yet the Directory does speak of sanctifying "these elements of Bread and Wine" and so

the prayer does refer to the elements but not in any sense that their substance would be changed. Rather than saying with Porter that the prayer was "not so much for the elements themselves", it would be more accurate to say that the prayer, so far as the elements are concerned, must be seen in the context of the whole service, the grace of God and the faith of the communicants.

After the elements had been "sanctified by the Word and Prayer" the Directory states that the minister was to take the bread and to break it with the following or similar words: "According to the holy institution, command, and example of our Blessed Saviour Jesus Christ, I take this Bread and, having given thanks, break it and give it unto you." He was then to communicate himself, further break the bread and give it to the communicants saying: "Take ye, eat ye: this is the Body of Christ which is broken for you: Do this in Remembrance of Him." A similar procedure was to be followed with the cup. In this sequence the manual actions and the delivery in this sequence are somewhat fused with the fraction followed by the distribution of the bread and then the taking of the cup followed by its distribution. The Service is concluded by a short optional address reminding worshippers of God's grace set forth in the Lord's Supper with an exhortation to them to walk worthily and a prayer of thanksgiving and supplication. No mention is made of singing or the Blessing but their use can be assumed.

That the Directory was followed in Ireland is shown by a summary of the Communion Service given by Robert Craighead, minister of First Derry, 1690-1711. He stated that after the sermon, the Institution was read, followed by an exhortation, "opening the nature and parts of the Sacrament", the "solemn sanctifying of the elements", further exhortations and thanksgivings. (23) From this description, however, it is clear that the sequence of the Directory was not reproduced exactly and it is reasonable to assume that the fact that the volume consisted of recommendations meant that ministers did interpret its rubrics with

some freedom.

According to J.M. Barkley, the Directory "exercised a tremendous influence in Irish Presbyterianism". (24) The General Synod published a Revision in 1825 and the General Assembly four versions 1841, 1859, 1868 and 1887. The structure of the original is followed in each instance although the revisions seem to aim at simplification, omitting the detailed instructions as to the content of prayers and exhortation.

So far as the Lord's Supper is concerned, none of the Irish Revisions give a complete structure for the Liturgy of the Word. In the directions for Communion the Revisions follow the original with some alteration of the structure to Psalm - Prayer - Words of Institution - Exhortation. No detailed directions for the prayer are given beyond stating it should be for "the presence, protection and blessing of God". The Institution is followed by the Exhortation, thus reversing, for no apparent reason, the order in the Directory. The first part of the exhortation, to be given from the pulpit, follows the pattern of the Directory in coupling the benefits of the sacrament with a warning to "the ignorant, the heretical, the scandalous and those who indulge secretly in any known sin not to approach the Table of the Lord." At this point the minister was to leave the pulpit and from the table address the communicants in an attempt "to stir up their hearts to gratitude and love". The possibility of having the elements carried in is removed for Revisions state that these were to be laid on the table "before the commencement of the services of the day."

Writing in 1906, John McIlveen, the minister of Crescent Church, Belfast, expressed particular regret that the setting apart of the elements appeared to receive little attention but was "often slurred over in the mode of administration" although he was careful to point out that declaring that the elements were no longer to be regarded as common implied no change in their substance. (25)

The Revisions beyond, stating that the minister was to "after Christ's example, offer thanks and

implore the blessing of God", give no details as to the content of the Consecratory Prayer or, to be accurate prayers, for despite the Westminster Assembly's rejection, after debate, of the Independent practice of having two prayers - one for the bread and one for the wine, this had become common in Irish Presbyterianism. The practice has however now died out - although Barkley, writing in 1956, mentioned that he knew of one congregation where it still happened. (26)

Again there is no clear separation between the manual actions and the distribution for the minister is directed to break the bread "in full view of the people" with the words: "According to the institution, command and example of our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, I take this bread, break it and give it to you in remembrance of the body which was broken for you."

Only the first two Revisions make any reference to the minister's communion, stating that after the communicants had received the elements, the minister was to communicate, unless another minister was present, from which it can be inferred that they were to serve each other.

In the conclusion to the service the Revisions follow the Directory's general pattern although with a tendency to pile up words. Before each group of communicants left the table they were to be addressed, the 1859 and subsequent editions suggesting that it should be about the communicants' obligations, the influence the sacrament should have and the need to cultivate a spirit of Christ. Thus the optional address of the Directory becomes compulsory in its Irish Revisions. The 1841 Revision appears to suggest yet another address after everyone has communicated. Later Revisions suggest a reading and a prayer of Thanksgiving. Again, the singing of a Psalm and the Blessing can be presupposed although they are not specifically mentioned.

It is difficult to avoid concluding that the Irish Revisions represent an impoverishment of the rite even compared to that of the Directory. The absence of a formal setting apart, the rejection of the Great

Entrance, the fusion of the manual actions with the distribution of the elements, the duplication of the prayer of consecration and the increased emphasis on exhortation all point to this.

With the Directory as the standard of worship, there was in Irish Presbyterianism from the end of the seventeenth century until the middle of the nineteenth, a long period when worship changed little. It was doubtless at the centre of the life of the church but it was a centre that was firmly fixed; worship happened Sunday by Sunday with minimal alteration in the midst of the great movements within the church or difficulties facing it. References to the Lord's Supper in, for example, the Records of The General Synod of Ulster are comparatively rare.

From about the middle of the nineteenth century one becomes aware of the expression of an increasing dissatisfaction with Irish Presbyterian worship - especially of its prayers and psalmody - but references to the Lord's Supper are few. A work like John McIlveen's The Church's Worship does include a section on the Lord's Supper, but while he calls for greater frequency of celebration, most of his references are to utilitarian aspects of the service and to what might be called the devotional benefits of receiving Communion.

It was 1923 before Irish Presbyterians published a full order for the celebration of the Sacrament. While the 1923 Book may be criticised at a number of points it must be remembered that there was considerable opposition to the whole concept of publishing any sort of service book. This sprung from what J.C. Johnston, the Convener of the Public Worship Committee described as Irish Presbyterians "hereditary hatred of anything in the form of a liturgy" (27) but was also to some extent a by product of the heated controversies about organs and hymns of the late nineteenth century which seem to have left the Church reluctant to appear to interfere too much in worship. The opposition reached its climax when the 1922 General Assembly refused to sanction the Book's publication but after Johnston's threatened resignation from the convenership of the Public Worship Committee,

permission was given to the Committee to publish under its own name, not that of the Assembly.(28) Revisions were issued in 1931 and 1942 - the latter edition "by authority of the General Assembly."

It must be remembered that the compilers of the book, while eager "to aid those on whom rests the responsibility of expressing the heart of the Church of God" did not possess the same background of liturgical and theological scholarship as those members of the Church Service Society of The Church of Scotland who were responsible for the preparation of Euchologion, first published in 1865 in an attempt to help remedy the state of worship in Scotland.(29) Drawn from a wide variety of sources the various editions of Euchologion were to have considerable influence on subsequent Reformed rites in English, including BPW(1923).

By 1923 various changes in the way the Lord's Supper was administered in Irish Presbyterianism had taken place. After a great deal of controversy non alcoholic wine had generally supplanted the alcoholic variety; with minimum controversy individual cups were replacing the common cup; the practice of receiving the elements at tables was disappearing in many congregations with apparently no controversy at all.(30)

Neither of the two earlier books provides any suggestion about the Liturgy of the Word apart from the inclusion in 1931 of five possible Scripture passages. More serious is the apparent assumption that Communion was to be regarded as an appendage to the ordinary Sunday service. This impression is supported by the wording of one of the rubrics: "When the observance of the sacrament follows the ordinary service, the latter should be shortened." What this shortening means can be seen in 1942 where only one lesson is included with the suggestion that it ought to be "a passage from the Gospels about the death of Christ" which seems to betray an emphasis that the Eucharist is certainly primarily, if not exclusively, about the death of Christ. This order allows for the possibility of an exhortation, a shortened and modernised version of that

in BCO(1564), immediately after the reading and before the prayer of confession and the sermon. There is also some confusion about the content of the sermon as it is suggested that this "may be The Communion Address".

So far as the structure and language of the liturgy of the Faithful are concerned, the first three editions of Public Worship lean heavily on Euchologion, although with some re-arrangement of the structure which is as follows in 1923 and 1931:

Exhortation - from Euchologion - based on BCO (1564)

Prayer for Pardon and Peace - from Euchologion.

Agnus Dei.

Praise - with entrance or unveiling of the elements.

and collection of the tokens.

Apostolic Benediction (as in Euchologion) or Pax.

Words of Institution

Address) "if thought desirable" or Apostles' Creed.

Setting Apart of the Elements.

Having the address or the Creed as alternatives is somewhat strange procedure although it was probably not intended that only one or the other could be used. The creed is introduced with a short formula "Almighty and Eternal God with Thy Holy Church throughout all the world - We believe" which may have been an attempt to make the recitation of the Creed more palatable to Irish Presbyterians, although the wording is again taken from Euchologion where, however, the Nicene Creed is used. There is in BPW (1942) some confusion between skeletal order for this part of the service and the more detailed order. The latter follows that of the earlier books although omitting for no apparent reason, the Apostolic Benediction or Pax and the setting apart of the elements - representing some impoverishment. The skeletal order is -

Offering and Dedication

Institution

Collection of Tokens

Psalm

Table Address (if not given in sermon)

It can only be assumed that these were intended as alternatives or that there was carelessness of the part of the compilers. In the three books the double consecration of the elements as found in the Irish Revisions of the Directory is replaced by a single prayer of consecration, described as a "Prayer of Access and Thanksgiving". The wording and content in all three books are virtually identical although in 1931 and 1942 there is some rearrangement of the sequence. The structure in 1923 is:

Prayer of the Veil

Mutilated Sursum Corda

Preface

Thanksgiving - for Creation, Redemption, the Holy Spirit, Sacraments and Ordinances

Sanctus with Hosanna

Benedictus with Hosanna

Thanksgiving - for Redemption and Providence

Anamnesis

Epiclesis

Petition for Pardon.

The structure is generally similar to that in Euchologion which however lacks thanksgiving for Creation, Redemption and Providence along with the Anamnesis - in the Irish Books these appear to be the work of the compilers. The prayer in Euchologion concludes with the Lord's Prayer - absent from the Irish Books at this point. Again much of the wording is taken from Euchologion, but the Irish Books omit or alter references to the concept of sacrifice or offering. Where in the Prayer of the Veil, Euchologion has: "that drawing near unto Thee with a pure heart and undefiled conscience, we may offer unto Thee a sacrifice in righteousness", the Irish Books substitute: "that drawing near unto Thee with a pure heart and undefiled conscience we may offer ourselves, body and souls and spirit, unto Thee a living sacrifice."

The three books maintain a fusion of the fraction and delivery with the result that, as Barkley says, "the breaking of bread and taking of cup" have become "merely utilitarian". (31) After repetition of how

Christ broke the bread it is distributed; a similar procedure being followed for the wine. No reference is made as to when the minister is to communicate. The conclusion of the Service again follows the structure of Euchologion.

In BPW (1923) it is as follows.

Pax

Exhortation to Loyalty and Service

Prayer - Thanksgiving, Petition for unity, self
dedication, optional Intercession,
Thanksgiving for the faithful departed.

Praise

Benediction.

In 1942, the Pax is omitted and the Exhortation is optional.

It is obvious that Euchologion had a major influence both in language and structure on the Communion Services of the first three Irish Books. When other material is inserted it has a somewhat clumsy style and is frequently didactic and repetitive. The inclusion of two addresses - one before and one after the distribution, in addition to the sermon, points to a tendency to mask the central actions of the Sacrament in words- although in all three books the first address is optional and in 1942 both are. It was only to be expected that the compilers of the 1923 Book would lean heavily on Euchologion - what is more surprising is that apart from some changes -mostly minor - the Service remained basically the same in 1931 and 1942.

Stocks of BPW (1942) appear to have sold out sometime by the mid fifties and with no copies available, the Book of Common Order, published by the Church of Scotland in 1940 became increasingly popular and was used by many ministers.

In 1965 the fourth edition of Public Worship was published. It would be no exaggeration to describe it as a tribute to the liturgical knowledge and insight of the Rev. Professor John M. Barkley, the convener of the Public Worship Committee. (In conversation, at least, BPW (1965) is often referred to as John Barkley's Book) whether that is intended as a compliment or an insult

rather depends on who is saying it!)

BPW (1965) is far from being merely a revision of BPW(1942). It signified a serious attempt to return to the principles on which Reformed Worship is based and was not content with simply reflecting what was current practice at the time of preparation. It broke new ground, or perhaps more accurately recovered old ground, in structuring the order for worship along the sequence: Preparation or Approach in adoration and confession; The Word of God in reading and sermon; Response to the Word in thanksgiving, intercession and dedication; Dismissal with God's Blessing. Instead of, as in the earlier Books, printing a limited number of orders of service with full prayers, prayers are arranged according to their type. In the Baptismal Order, a question to the congregation was introduced along with a petition that the Holy Spirit would sanctify the congregation and the water to be used. In the Marriage Ceremony the vows are preceded by the scripture readings "as it is on the basis of their teaching that the marriage covenant is entered into." (32) The Order for Holy Communion to be considered below, while reproducing much of the wording of BCO(1940) and its predecessors, also includes a number of significant alterations and additions.

Not that BPW (1965) was automatically accepted by all members of the General Assembly. Despite the fact that the Public Worship Committee was at pains to point out that The Book was for guidance and help and was "in no way binding on individuals". There was an attempt, defeated by 239 to 164, at the 1964 General Assembly to have the Book rejected. (33)

Before considering the Communion Order, in detail a note of caution should perhaps be sounded! When Canon Alan Harper, then a theological student carried out a survey of eucharistic practice in the Presbytery of Iveagh in 1977, he was surprised to discover that BPW (1965) did not provide the norm in practice. (34) Similarly, when two years later, I sent questionnaires to ministers in the East Belfast and Route Presbyteries, the response indicated that nineteen ministers used BCO (1940); fourteen, BPW (1965); two,

BPW (1942). That however has to be modified by accompanying comments, e.g. "BCO - but not to letter"; "BPW = adapted"; "a wide variety of service material fed into general framework of BPW (1965)". Six ministers claimed that they devised their own order and another that he used the "usual rural order of service". Even, however, when ministers stated that they used BCO (1940) or BPW (1965) the Orders of Service enclosed showed, often considerable, deviations.

BPW (1965) differs from its predecessors in that the Communion Service is considered a unity consisting of the proclamation of the Word and the celebration of the Sacrament. Barkley writes: "The Lord's Supper is not an appendix to the Sunday Morning Service, rather the Sunday Morning Service was an abbreviated Lord's Supper (that is the same service without the actual celebration). The Communion Service, from The Scripture Sentences to the Benediction, is a unity, and the actual celebration is a unity within a unity." (35)

Thus the structure of the Liturgy of the Word is similar to that of the Sunday Morning Service, with the omission of the Children's Address.

Scripture Sentences

Psalm or Hymn of Adoration

Prayer; Confession; Pardon; Petitions for purity,
faith, hope love; Illumination.

Old Testament Reading.

Psalm, Hymn or Anthem

Epistle and Gospel

Psalm or Hymn

Sermon

Prayer for the right reception of the Word;

Intercessions; Thanksgiving for the faithful
departed.

There are three readings, Barkley stating that a Gospel portion should be read at each service as "Christian worship has its whole meaning in the person and work of God in Christ." (36) In practice three readings are not the norm - of 20 orders of service returned from ministers in East Belfast and Route, no fewer than 11 included only one lesson. The desire to

shorten the service still appears to hold sway! Unlike BCO(1940) where the readings and prayers are separated by the Intercessions and the Creed, readings and sermon in BPW (1965) are a unity.

There are also more subtle changes. While, in the Prayer for Pardon, the earlier Irish Books have "partaking by faith of the body and blood of Thy dear Son", BPW (1965) following BCO (1940) has "partaking by a divine mystery of the body and blood of Thy dear Son." - underlining the fact that sharing in the Lords Supper and being able to feed on Christ is a mystery which no formula can satisfactorily explain.

The order for the first part of the Liturgy of the Faithful in BPW (1965) is as follows:

Offerings

Invitation

Comfortable Words - Matt. 11: 28; John 6: 35;
Matt. 5:6.

Psalm or Hymn - with collection of tokens.

Words of Institution

Nicene Creed

Pax

Psalm or Hymn - with entrance or unveiling of the elements.

Taking of elements to be set apart.

Much of the wording of BCO (1940) has been retained but this order has a number of significant features.

1. The Offering is to be taken up immediately after the prayer following the sermon. Yet this is one point where common practice frequently diverges from the recommendation. Out of 13 orders from East Belfast - only four followed this - the remainder had the offering before the sermon. In Route two orders failed to mention the offering at all. This reflects a rubric for the Lord's Supper in The Westminster Directory where it is clearly stated that the "Collection for the Poor is to be so ordered that no part of the public worship is to be hindered." There has been however variety of practice within Irish Presbyterianism. In different districts, it was collected at the Church door, outside, before the service began or at the

table. The Kirk Session then carefully decided where the proceeds were to be sent.(37) This collection for the poor can be traced still in a number of congregations which have offerings, sometimes retiring offerings, for Benevolent Funds. In a number of congregations the offering is still taken at the Church door before the Communion Service for there can be the feeling that material things should not be handled during a sacramental service.

2. The Prayer of the Veil and the Offertory Prayer, both present in BCO (1940) are absent from this rite on the grounds that: "In the primitive rites there was nothing corresponding to an offertory Prayer at the moment of the offertory and the meaning of the offertory expressed in words in the Eucharistic Prayer itself. The Great Entrance and the Unveiling assures the concept of the offertory in action."(38)

3. The Invitation, absent from the earlier Irish Books, is to "all who are in communion with the Church Universal". Members of any branch of the Church "who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity" are invited to share. Thus it is not a completely open invitation although in practice some ministers do omit thereference to Church members, simply inviting those who love the Lord Jesus Christ.

4. The Comfortable Words are included for the first time in an Irish order.

5. Both the Nicene Creed and the setting apart of the elements use the first person plural to emphasise the corporate nature of the rite. In practice few congregations say the Creed.

6. Unlike BCO (1940) the Words of Institution precede the Creed, thus following the sequence of the earlier Irish Books.

7. The Pax, rather than the Grace, which is found in the Scottish Book is used in order to bring this part of the service nearer to the Kiss of Peace in the early Church.(39)

8. In order to maintain the unity of the Great Entrance, the Unveiling and the Setting Apart, these are not as in BCO (1940) separated.(40) In practice, however, most congregations would have the elements on

the table before the service.

9. There is no place for a Table Address although some congregations do have one. Similarly the Exhortation disappears: Barkley's view being the content of these properly belongs to the Preparation Service. (41)

10. Two items of praise, rather than one are included with the suggestion that during the first, "Those not communicating may leave should they wish to do so". While the dismissal of the catechumens has a long history in general most Irish Presbyterians who are not communicants would absent themselves from the Lord's Supper. It is also suggested that the tokens should be collected during or immediately after this singing. Practice again varies - with tokens often collected as the worshippers enter the Church. The continuing use of tokens may now be anachronistic - as worshippers can communicate without them or have them written before the service. The main purpose of their distribution seems to be to remind people of the service or as means of keeping the Communion Roll up to date. Should Communion become generally more frequent - then tokens may disappear altogether.

Thus, this section of the Liturgy of the Faithful in BPW (1965) represents considerable enrichment as compared to that in the earlier books and also has significant, but theologically grounded alterations from that of BCO (1940).

Of the Orders of Service received only three followed the structure of BPW (1965) clearly but even three was some slight deviation. Others showed evidence of a wide variety of practice and idiosyncratic approach including the following:

- (a) Invitation - Praise - Tokens - Welcome -
- (b) Praise - Tokens - Welcome - Scripture Sentences - Institution - Setting Apart.
- (c) Welcome New Communicants - Invitation - Praise - Institution.
- (d) Praise - Institution - Creed - Tokens - Hymn
- (e) Praise - Tokens - Institution - Exhortation - Praise.

The structure of the Eucharistic Prayer is

virtually identical to that in BCO (1940) as is much of the wording although there are significant additions. It is prefaced by the salutation and Sursum Corda but despite Barkley's comment that he would like to see the Sursum Corda restored to general use, this has not been the case. (427) The structure of the prayer is:

Preface with Thanksgiving for Creation and Providence

Proper Preface

Sanctus Thanksgiving for Redemption

Anamnesis

Oblation

Epiclesis

Petition for the fulfilment of God's purpose.

Ascription of Glory

The Lord's Prayer.

The wording of the Preface is identical with that in BCO (1940) but while BCO (1940) provides eleven Proper Prefaces, BPW (1965) has nine. The Benedictus qui venit is not included on the grounds that its joining to the Sanctus arose from a conflation of texts. (43)

The beginning of the Thanksgiving for Redemption stresses the incarnation, life, death and resurrection of Christ in a way that this part of the prayer in BCO (1940) does not. The Irish text then follows the wording of BCO (1940): "Not as we ought, but as we are able, do we bless Thee for His holy incarnation, for his perfect life on earth." But while BCO (1940) then goes on to speak of Christ's suffering, death, resurrection, ascension, continual intercession and reign, BPW (1965) takes a different direction by introducing the Narrative of Institution into the prayer. This is a new feature in Irish Presbyterian Communion Services and one Anglican scholar stated that through its inclusion "Dr. Barkley has brought his Church into the forefront of Presbyterian Liturgical Reform." (44) The words after the Narrative -- "and after He was risen, He was known to His disciples in the breaking of bread" - also represent an important innovation and were included in order to give "a fuller expression of the Eucharist as a festival of the Resurrection" (45)

Christ's Resurrection and Ascension are mentioned in the opening of the anamnesis, unlike BCO(1940) where they are included in the Thanksgiving for Redemption. BCO (1940) has the following wording: "Wherefore, having in remembrance the work and passion of our Saviour Christ and pleading his eternal sacrifice..." The last phrase, "and pleading his eternal sacrifice", is omitted in BPW (1965) although it was included in the original draft. It is not difficult to understand the reason for this in that anything which, even remotely, savoured of the idea of a repeated sacrifice would be anathema to many Irish Presbyterians. Barkley has written: "When we plead His eternal sacrifice, we desire Him to unite our offerings and prayers with His which are eternal and thus memorial in time and share in part of that eternal memorial. His sacrifice is not repeatable, but it is continually renewed; the remembering is not mere commemoration, but a real uniting possible by grace and through faith. This is not mere intellectual assent, but a committal of the whole person to Him, and that not simply as an individual, but also corporately within the Church." (46) Elsewhere, Barkley in his critical analysis of the phrase has shown that it is truly evangelical and in harmony with the thought of both Calvin and Zwingli. (47) The epiclesis is almost identical in wording with that of BCO (1940) and similar to the earlier Irish books but with one significant difference for, while the other books speak of sending down the Holy Spirit, BPW (1965) has "We most humbly beseech Thee through The Holy Spirit" in order "to avoid any suggestion that up to this, the Holy Spirit was absent, being up there." (48)

The prayer concludes with self oblation, a petition that God will fulfil the purpose of His redeeming love, an Ascription of Praise and the Lord's Prayer. Again in practice while many services may omit the Lords Prayer altogether, those that include it may do so in the Liturgy of the Word.

BPW (1965) follows the sequence of BCO (1940) in operating the manual actions of the breaking of the bread and the taking of the cup from the distribution.

The Agnus Dei follows the manual actions and the words used at the distribution are based on those of The Westminster Directory. It is clearly stated that after the Agnus Dei, the minister should serve himself and then distribute to the elders and those assisting him before the congregation is served. In practice evidence suggests that this is largely ignored. Despite the universal usage since the earliest days of the Church that the minister should receive first and that this ensures that the "minister is to set an example of humble obedience to our Lord's commands by receiving what He gives, and to set the example to others he must receive first"(49) it has to be recognised that any attempt on the part of the minister to enforce this is liable to be misunderstood.

The conclusion to the Order is in common with that of BCO (1564) brief and economical:

Ascription of Praise

Prayer - Thanksgiving and Union with The faithful Departed.

Psalm or Hymn of Thanksgiving

Dismissal

Apostolic Benediction.

The Dismissal, not found in BCO (1940) is intended to link worship and service.

The Communion Order in BPW (1965) while clearly drawing much from other Reformed rites and in particular that of BCO (1940) also shows evidence of independent preparation and a willingness to make important changes. For the first time in Irish Presbyterian Service Books a complete order for the Liturgy of the Word is provided; the sequence in the Liturgy of the Faithful has been carefully thought out, the Prayer of Consecration contains new elements for Presbyterians, at least; the Fraction and the Taking of the Cup are separated from the Delivery. As a liturgy it can stand comparison with any even though it has been clearly indicated above that in practice there are deviations, often considerable, from it.

The language is, however, firmly traditional yet BPW(1965) was published at a time when most other churches were giving serious thought to liturgical

revision including the use of contemporary language in prayer and the possibility of incorporating modern Biblical translations. The Liturgical Commission of the Church of England was experimenting with prayers in the "you" form in 1968 - only three years after the publication of BPW (1965) and around the same time it was becoming not uncommon to hear God addressed as "you" in Irish Presbyterian worship. (50) Thus, in some ways, BPW (1965) could be accused of being out of date shortly after its production although, this could certainly be partly explained by the long delay of twenty three years between its appearance and that of BPW (1942).

In 1980 the Public Worship Committee received the General Assembly's authority to publish a series of experimental revisions of the contents of BPW (1965) in order to supplement it by offering services "in both traditional and modern language." (51)

In fact, the revised Communion Service, produced in 1989, is entirely in contemporary language. The structures of the Liturgy of the Word is identical to that in BPW (1965) but with a choice of four prayers of confession and supplication and of two of intercession. Following the prayer after the sermon the sequence is somewhat altered to:

Offerings

Psalm or Hymn - collection of tokens

Invitation

Comfortable Words

Psalm or Hymn -- Entrance or Unveiling of the elements

Nicene or Apostles' Creed

Pax

Institution

Taking of elements to be set apart.

The Comfortable Words and the Institution are taken from the New International Version; the Apostles Creed, while strictly a Baptismal formulary is given as an alternative in the hope that the use of a Creed will be encouraged.

Three Prayers of Consecration are provided: the first is essentially a recasting of the prayer in

BPW(1965) in contemporary language although before the Narrative of Institution there is a recitation of Christ's Mighty Acts. The second prayer has a short preface similar to that used in the Alternative Service Book of the Church of England with the thanksgivings for Creation, Providence and Redemption immediately following the Sanctus. Three forms of this Thanksgiving are given along with two forms of the epiclesis and two forms of the concluding self oblation and petition. The intention of providing a large number of alternatives was to encourage thought and increased preparation in the prayer. The third prayer of Consecration is much shorter, "primarily intended for use when children are present, or with the sick", although containing all the elements of the other prayers. The remainder of the order is again identical with BPW (1965) but with a larger choice of post-Communion prayers including one for use at Easter. But as I was closely involved in the preparation of this Order comment might be incongruous.

It is impossible to gauge the precise use made of any of the Orders discussed above. Barkley has written: "Presbyterianism has always been opposed, and rightly so, to a fixed Liturgy...allowing no variation. On the other hand, the use of a Liturgy which allows freedom is in harmony with Presbyterian tradition." (52) It is perhaps unfortunate that in a determined, and correct, attempt to maintain its heritage of free prayer, Irish Presbyterianism has often failed to recognise that distinction. The results can be lack of careful preparation for worship, carelessness of expression, the maintenance of idiosyncratic customs and a failure to draw from the centuries old experience of the Christian Church at worship.

NOTES

1 A Short History of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland (Belfast, 1963) 113

2 For the background to BCO(1564), see J.M.Barkley, The Worship of the Reformed Church (London, 1966) 10-25; W.D.Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship (London,

1936) 87-124

3. "Worship in the Kirk" in Reaction and Reform ed.

D. Shaw (Edinburgh, 1967) 73

4 The Worship of the Scottish Reformed Church
1550-1638 (London, 1931), 120.

5 History of the Presbyterian Church in
Ireland ed.

Killen (Belfast, 1867) Vol. I 118-119

6 W.D. Maxwell, John Knox's Genevan Service
Book, 1556 (Edinburgh, 1931) 134

7 See W.D. Bailie, Worship in Ulster prior to the
Introduction of the Westminster Directory in 1647
(Belfast, 1987) 11-16

8. op.cit. 6

9. op.cit. 72

10 Letters and Journals ed. Laing (Edinburgh, 1841)
Vol. I 249

11 Short History 113

12 See Horton Davies, Worship and Theology in
England, Vol. I From Cranmer to Hooker (Princeton,
1970) 257-269

13 The Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland
(Edinburgh, 1882) 8

14 loc.cit It is perhaps unfortunate that Cheyne
has linked presbytery and extempore prayer over against
episcopacy and liturgical worship - the lines of
demarcation were never as simple as that!

15 The Six Mile Water Revival of 1625 (Newcastle,
1976) 22

16 The Worship of the English Puritans (London,
1948) 157

17 op.cit. Vol. II 195, 149

18 John Lightfoot, Works ed. Pitman (London, 1824)
Vol. XIII 286-289

19 Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of
Scotland, 1638-1842 ed. Pitcairn (Edinburgh, 1843)
115-116

20 One of the objections to the Book of Common
Prayer by the English Presbyterians after the
Restoration was that the manner of consecrating the
elements was "not explicit enough" (Barkley, The
Worship of the Reformed Church 50-51)

- 21 Answer to George Keith's Libel in The Life and Writings of Francis Makemie ed. Schlenther (Philadelphia, 1971) 82
- 22 Presbyterian Worship (Belfast, n.d.) 13
- 23 An Answer to the Bishop of Derry's Second Admonition (Dublin, 1696) 56
- 24 The Westminster Formularies in Irish Presbyterianism (Belfast, 1956) 30-31
- 25 op.cit. 225-226
- 26 op.cit. 58
- 27 Irish Presbyterian, August 1923
- 28 Minutes of the General Assembly 1922 32-33, 42
- 29 For the origins of the Church Service Society, see W.D.Maxwell, A History of Worship in the Church of Scotland 176-180
- 30 See R.S.Tosh, The Origins and Development of Irish Presbyterian Worship (Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, 1983) 225-230, 240-242
- 31 J.M.Barkley, The Worship of the Reformed Church 51
- 32 J.M.Barkley, "The Theology of Liturgy" in Liturgical Review Vol.III.1, May 1973, 9
- 33 Minutes of the General Assembly 1964, 23
- 34 The Current Eucharistic Practice of the Presbyterian Church in the Presbytery of Iveagh (Unpublished Typescript) 1 I am grateful to Canon Harper for permission to quote from this.
- 35 The Book of Public Worship. An Open Letter (Belfast, 1965) 11 This pamphlet was intended for those conducting worship. The title page has the invitation, "Please read, then, if you wish"- (with an arrow pointing towards the waste paper basket) "On the other hand, you may prefer to keep it." Barkley in his Worship of the Reformed Church makes frequent reference to the theological aspects and emphases of the Order.
- 36 ibid. 3
- 37 See J.M.Barkley, "The Evidence of old Irish Session Books on the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper" in Church Service Society Annual, 1952, 29-30
- 38 J.M.Barkley, The Worship of the Reformed Church 48
- 39 ibid.

- 40 ibid.
- 41 op.cit. . 57
- 42 Presbyterianism (Belfast, 1956) 55
- 43 J.M.Barkley, The Worship of the Reformed Church
49
- 44 Dean Charles Gray-Stack, Focus, July 1965,
161-162
- 45 J.M.Barkley, The Worship of the Reformed Church
50
- 46 ibid. 87
- 47 "'Pleading His eternal sacrifice' in the Reformed
Liturgy" in The Sacrifice of Praise ed. B.D. Spinks
(Rome, 1981) 123-140
- 48 J.M.Barkley, The Worship of the Reformed Church
51
- 49 W.D.Maxwell, A History of Worship in the Church of
Scotland 62 n.1
- 50 See R.C.D.Jasper and P.F.Bradshaw, A Companion to
the Alternative Service Book (London, 1986) 25-27
- 51 Minutes of the General Assembly 1980, 63
- 52 Presbyterianism (Belfast, 1956) 51

Rev. Robert Samuel Tosh, B.Sc., B.D., Ph.D. was student of Dr Barkley. He is editor of Religious Programmes for the BBC in Northern Ireland. His doctoral thesis was entitled "An Examination of the Origins and Development of Irish Presbyterian Worship".